



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 23.11.2011  
SEC(2011) 1402 final

Volume 5

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER**

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT ON SPORT ACTIONS**

*Accompanying the document*

**Proposal for a**

**REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL**

**establishing a single Education, Training, Youth and Sport Programme for the period  
2014-2020**

{COM(2011) 788}

{SEC(2011) 1403}

## **PART 4: SPORT**

**Lead DG:** DG Education and Culture

**Other involved services:** SG, SJ, DG BUDG, DG COMM, DG COMP, DG DEVCO, DG ECFIN, DG ELARG, DG EMPL, DG ENTR, DG ENV, DG ESTAT, DG HOME, DG INFSO, DG JUST, DG MARKT, DG REGIO, DG RTD, DG SANCO, DG TAXUD, EEAS

**Agenda planning identification number:** 2011/EAC/001

**Disclaimer:** This report commits only the Commission's services involved in its preparation and does not prejudge the final form of any decision to be taken by the Commission

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Procedural issues and consultations.....	5
1.1.	Identification.....	5
1.2.	Organisation and Timing .....	5
1.3.	Impact Assessment Board's recommendations .....	5
1.4.	Consultation and expertise.....	6
2.	Context setting and problem definition .....	7
2.1.	Context.....	7
2.2.	Problem definition .....	10
2.3.	Baseline scenario .....	16
2.4.	Justification for EU intervention and EU added value .....	19
3.	OBJECTIVES.....	20
4.	POLICY OPTIONS .....	22
4.1.	Policy Option 1: "No further EU action" (baseline scenario).....	22
4.2.	Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme" .....	22
4.3.	Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport" .....	24
4.4.	Option discarded at an early stage: .....	24
5.	ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS .....	25
5.1.	Social impacts .....	25
5.2.	Economic impacts.....	29
5.3.	Environmental impacts .....	30
5.4.	Impacts on fundamental rights and third countries.....	30
5.5.	Summary of key impacts .....	31
6.	COMPARING THE OPTIONS.....	33
7.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION.....	37
7.1.	Framework for monitoring and evaluation .....	37
7.2.	Indicators for future monitoring and evaluation .....	37
	ANNEX I : Consultation process.....	42

ANNEX II : Rationale for option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme" .....	44
ANNEX III : Indicative allocations .....	57
ANNEX IV: Executive Summary of the Report on the Evaluation of the Preparatory Actions and Special Events in the field of sport .....	59
ANNEX V: Executive summary of the Impact Assessment accompanying the Communication from the Commission "Developing the European Dimension in Sport" .....	71

## 1. PROCEDURAL ISSUES AND CONSULTATIONS

### 1.1. Identification

**Lead service:** DG EAC.E.3 (Sport Unit)

**Other services involved:** SG, SJ, DG BUDG, DG COMM, DG COMP, DG DEVCO, DG ECFIN, DG EMPL, DG ELARG, DG ENTR, DG ENV, DG ESTAT, DG HOME, DG INFSO, DG JUST, DG MARKT, , DG REGIO, DG RTD, DG SANCO, DG TAXUD, EEAS

**Commission Work Programme reference number:** CWP 2011/EAC/001

**Subject:** Proposal for incentive measures in the field of sport 2014-2020

### 1.2. Organisation and Timing

**Table 1 – Impact assessment procedural steps**

Action/Steps	Date
Informal inter-service consultation about online questionnaire	22-26 Febr. 2010
Questionnaire for online consultation approved	10 March 2010
Bilateral consultations with stakeholders	Febr. – June 2010
Launch of public consultation	7 April 2010
European Sport Forum & Informal Ministerial Meeting, Madrid	19-21 April 2010
End of consultation process (8 weeks after launch)	2 June 2010
Analysis of the results of the consultation process	June – Sept. 2010
Finalisation of Roadmap	October 2010
First meeting of the Inter-Service Steering Group (discussion of the Roadmap)	2 February 2011
Finalisation of draft Impact Assessment Report	15 July 2011
Second Inter-Service Steering Group meeting on draft Impact Assessment Report	19 July 2011
Submission of Impact Assessment Report to Impact Assessment Board	3 August 2011
Impact Assessment Board meeting	7 September 2011
Impact Assessment Board opinion	9 September 2011

### 1.3. Impact Assessment Board's recommendations

On 3 August 2011, DG EAC submitted to the Impact Assessment Board (IAB) four Impact Assessment (IA) reports relating to the single Education, Training, Youth and Sport Programme for the period 2014-2020. With regard to the Sport strand of the single programme, the IAB noted in its Opinion of 9 September 2011 the need to clarify its objectives and rationale, namely by focusing the problem definition on issues with the strongest EU added value potential. The IAB also recommended to adapt the objectives to the available resources and to better show how the proposed actions would contribute to solving the identified problems. The Board finally asked to make it clearer that the main reason for including sport in the single Education programme was administrative efficiency rather than potential policy synergies.

As a consequence, this IA report has been modified to take into account the Board's comments. In particular, the problem definition section (section 2) has been improved by reinforcing the link with the results of the 2010 IA report that led to the adoption of the 2011 Communication on sport. References to exogenous elements affecting the EU's population growth have been included in the description of the baseline scenario to better define the current situation and expected developments. The added value potential of proposed measures has been clarified. The objectives have been put in close relation with the identified problems (section 3). The envisaged incentive measures have been presented in more detail, notably in Annex II which illustrates option 2 (as defined in section 4). The report also demonstrates more clearly the rationale behind the inclusion of sport as a Sub-Programme within a Single education programme (section 6).

#### 1.4. Consultation and expertise

##### *Consultation<sup>1</sup>*

The Commission launched various consultation exercises during the first half of 2010<sup>2</sup>. Different types of stakeholders and experts were invited to participate in the consultation and dialogue in view of the definition and planning of EU initiatives in the field of sport following the entry into force of the new Treaty competence on sport (Article 165 TFEU): Member States, the sport movement, relevant international organisations, and the general public (online consultation). The consultations covered both policy aspects of sport at EU level and aspects related to possible future incentive measures in the field of sport. Details about the categories of different consulted stakeholders and relevant meetings and events, as well as about the timing of the consultation exercise are given in Annex I.

The **results of the public consultation** are an important source of information to identify areas that can be considered as representing key challenges for sport in Europe from a stakeholder perspective, and notably the following:

- Insufficient availability of sport and physical activity at all levels of education;
- Insufficient recognition of voluntary activity in sport;
- Doping as a major threat to fairness in sporting competitions;
- Lack of attention for the societal value of sport as compared to its commercial aspects;
- Commercial pressure endangering the original spirit of sport based on fair play.

The consultation also yielded useful indications regarding priority areas for future EU action. The areas receiving the highest degree of attention were the following:

- Promotion of the social and educational functions of sport, including health-enhancing physical activity, participation levels in sport, quality training for sport professionals, integration of sport in education policies, sport for all, and sport in relation to social integration and social inclusion;
- Recognition of and support for volunteering in sport and the promotion of public and private financing of sport, as a means to support sport structures at grassroots level;

---

<sup>1</sup> Consultations were carried out in line with the “General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission” - COM(2002) 704.

<sup>2</sup> The report presenting the results of these consultations is available on the Commission's website: [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc/a/100726\\_online\\_consultation\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc/a/100726_online_consultation_report.pdf)

- Protection of the physical and moral integrity of sportspeople, in particular the fight against doping and the protection of minors in sport;
- Promotion of fairness and openness in sporting competitions as well as of the ethical and social values of sport, including the fight against discrimination, racism, xenophobia and violence in sport and the fight against financial crime in sport.

Horizontal priorities that were identified included:

- Support for knowledge-based decision-making in the field of sport;
- Promotion of networking and exchange of best practices;
- Support for strengthened dialogue with sport organisations and for EU guidance on the application of EU law to sport.

The problem definition, the identification of objectives and the policy options described in the following sections of the IA reflect the outcomes of the consultations carried out in 2010.

### *External expertise*

An evaluation of the Preparatory Actions and Special Events in the field of sport was launched in December 2010. The evaluation was carried out by a team of independent experts led by Economisti Associati. The final evaluation report is available on the Commission's website<sup>3</sup>. The executive summary of the evaluation report is presented in Annex IV to this report. Results from the evaluation have been used as a source of evidence for this Impact Assessment. The evaluation underlines the value added that the EU can bring in supporting trans-national exchanges and the creation/reinforcement of networks aimed at generating, sharing and spreading experiences and knowledge about different issues affecting sport at the European level. The evaluation also found value in promoting certain types of (mainly non-commercial) sport events addressing wider societal issues, noting however that support for these events should be subject to open procedures with clearly defined award criteria. The team of experts also assisted the services of the Commission in providing input for the drafting of this report.

It should be underlined that the main task of the evaluation was to analyse and assess the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as the EU-added value, of the Preparatory Actions and special events in the field of sport 2009 and 2010. The scope of the evaluation did not include a detailed consideration of activities supported in 2010 beyond the selection of proposals, nor did it include activities supported under the 2011 Annual Work Programme because the timing of the evaluation did not allow it. The evaluation did not include activities supported under the 2011 Annual Work Programme because at the time of writing an open call for proposals had only just been launched.

## **2. CONTEXT SETTING AND PROBLEM DEFINITION**

### **2.1. Context**

#### *General context*

The overall context of the planned initiative is **Europe 2020**, the EU's growth strategy for the coming decade, approved by the 27 Heads of State and Government in June 2010. It should

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/doc/evaluation\\_final\\_report\\_prepact\\_special\\_events\\_20110727.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/doc/evaluation_final_report_prepact_special_events_20110727.pdf)

help the EU and the Member States deliver high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion. Europe 2020 is intended to mobilise all existing EU policies, instruments and laws, as well as financial and coordination instruments. Resources, including funding programmes, should therefore be designed to drive the Europe 2020 strategy and be channelled towards the ambitious objectives on employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate/energy to be reached by 2020. The sport sector and activities in this field contribute to the achievement of the defined goals with regard to smart and inclusive growth, notably through the sector's potential to generate growth and jobs and to foster social inclusion.

On 29 July 2011, the European Commission launched its Communication "A budget for Europe 2020"<sup>4</sup> on the next **multiannual financial framework**, outlining its proposal on the structure and priorities for the EU budget for 2014-2020. The Commission's ambition for the next EU budget is to spend differently, concentrating on delivering the Europe 2020 agenda. In the Communication presenting the budget allocations, the Commission proposes to allocate EUR 15.2 billion to a single programme on Education, Training, Youth and Sport which includes a sub-programme for sport, as follows:

*"As part of the Education Europe programme, the proposed Sport sub-programme will focus on:*

- tackling transnational threats that are specific to sport such as doping, violence, racism and intolerance, or issues relating to the integrity of competitions and sportspersons;
- developing European cooperation in sport through, for example, guidelines for dual careers of athletes or benchmarks for good governance of sporting organisations; and
- supporting grassroots sports organisations which can play a role in addressing wider socioeconomic challenges such as social inclusion.

*This programme will bring EU added-value to issues arising from the specific nature of sport, mobilising private-sector financing from actors in the field of sport, and supporting organisations at the base of the sporting pyramid - not the top professional level."*

#### *Specific policy context*

The inclusion of an EU competence for sport<sup>5</sup> in **Article 165 of the Lisbon Treaty** (TFEU) provides for the opportunity to develop the European dimension in sport in a new policy context by means of supportive, coordinating and supplementary action. In line with this article, "the Union shall contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues, while taking account of the specific nature of sport, its structures based on voluntary activity and its social and educational function." EU action shall be aimed at "developing the European dimension in sport, by promoting fairness and openness in sporting competitions and co-operation between bodies responsible for sports, and by protecting the physical and moral integrity of sportsmen and sportswomen, especially the youngest sportsmen and sportswomen." The instruments at the EU's disposal to achieve these objectives are defined as (1) incentive measures and (2) Council Recommendations.

Before the new competence entered into force, EU level activities in the field of sport were carried out solely on the basis of other Treaty provisions. The policy process was driven by

---

<sup>4</sup> COM(2011) 500 final



the Commission's 2007 **White Paper on Sport**<sup>6</sup>, which was accompanied by an Action Plan "Pierre de Coubertin" that engaged the Commission. The implementation of the 53 Actions required close cooperation with stakeholders and has meanwhile been accomplished.

Following the White Paper, in 2008 the European Parliament adopted a Resolution welcoming the vision presented by the Commission and requesting a special budget line for Preparatory Actions in the field of sport. In line with this Resolution, the Commission adopted three Annual Work Programmes (in 2009, 2010 and 2011) on grants and contracts for the **“Preparatory Actions in the field of sport”** and **“Special annual events”**. The overall objective of the Preparatory Actions is to prepare future EU actions in the field of sport in view of the implementation of the sport provisions in the Lisbon Treaty. The specific objectives of the Annual Work Programmes are threefold:

- 1) To identify future policy actions through studies, surveys, conferences and seminars in order to develop better knowledge of the field of sport, their problems and needs
- 2) To test/support the establishment and functioning of suitable networks and exchange of best practice in policy fields already identified in the White Paper on Sport
- 3) To promote greater European visibility at special sporting events identified by the European Parliament in the framework of the budgetary procedure.

Table 2 hereafter outlines the types of interventions and main areas supported in line with these objectives, and the budget allocations for 2009-2011:

**Table 2 – Main areas supported through the Preparatory Actions and Special Events in the field of Sport**

Year	2009		2010		2011	
<b>Preparatory Actions</b>						
<b>Budget</b>	67%		36%		43%	
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Types and areas of intervention</b>					
1) Better knowledge	2 studies 3 conferences		2 studies 3 conferences		4 studies 1 conference	
2) Networks / exchange of best practices	18 transnational projects	<i>Sport and:</i> health, education, gender, disability	12 transnational projects	<i>Sport and:</i> anti-doping, volunteering, migrants	<i>Call currently open</i>	<i>Sport and:</i> good governance, racism and antidiscrimination
<b>Special events</b>						
<b>Budget</b>	33%		64%		57%	
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Types of intervention</b>					
3) Eur. visibility	2 events		2 events		2 events	
<b>Total budget</b>	<b>7,5 mEUR</b>		<b>11 mEUR</b>		<b>7 mEUR</b>	

<sup>5</sup> This IA uses the term “sport” in line with the definition established by the Council of Europe in its 1992 European Sport Charter and used by the Commission in its 2007 White Paper on Sport: "Sport means all forms of physical activity which, through casual or organised participation, aim at expressing or improving physical fitness and mental well-being, forming social relationships or obtaining results in competition at all levels."

<sup>6</sup> COM(2007) 391, 11.7.2007

On 18 January 2011, the European Commission adopted its **Communication "Developing the European Dimension in Sport"**<sup>7</sup>. The Communication builds on the 2007 White Paper on Sport. It proposes concrete actions for the Commission and/or the Member States within three broad chapters: the societal role of sport, the economic dimension of sport and the organisation of sport. The actions proposed in the Communication aim to encourage debate among stakeholders, address EU-level challenges in sport and help the sector develop. A number of these actions refer to support for transnational projects and activities as an instrument to address the policy objectives identified in the Communication.

As a response to the Communication, the Council adopted a Resolution on a three-year **EU Work Plan for Sport** for the period up to mid-2014<sup>8</sup>. It invites Member States and the Commission to give priority to the following themes: 1. integrity of sport, in particular the fight against doping, match-fixing and the promotion of good governance; 2. social values of sport, in particular health, social inclusion, education and volunteering; and 3. economic aspects of sport, especially suitable financing of grassroots sports and evidence-based policy making. The Council agreed on specific actions in line with these priorities, to be implemented with the help of six Expert Groups. The Council will assess the implementation of the Work Plan on the basis of a report from the Commission by the end of 2013.

## 2.2. Problem definition

### *The nature of problems affecting sport*

The definition of the problems described hereafter builds on the Impact Assessment carried out in 2010 (section 2.2 - Main Challenges) and published as an accompanying document to the Commission's Communication on sport".<sup>9</sup> The executive summary of the 2010 Impact Assessment is presented in Annex V. The 2010 Impact Assessment had the purpose of helping the Commission to develop and propose a suitable initiative to implement the new provisions on sport laid down in the Lisbon Treaty. It identified several challenges and threats to sport and pointed out those areas where it is appropriate for the EU to intervene. The 2010 Impact Assessment led to the adoption of the 2011 Communication as the preferred strategic option for the Commission to implement the new EU competence for sport. It also referred to the necessity of carrying out another Impact Assessment on incentive measures in the field of sport based on the evaluation of Preparatory Actions – which is the objective of this report.

The 2010 IA report identified the following general and specific problems affecting sport at EU level:

- Challenges connected with sport's health-enhancing, social and educational functions:
  - Health concerns due to lack of physical activity;

---

<sup>7</sup> COM(2011) 12 final

<sup>8</sup> Resolution of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on a European Union Work Plan for Sport for 2011-2014. Official Journal of the EU, 2011/C 162/01

<sup>9</sup> SEC(2011) 67 final

- Social exclusion of disadvantaged groups and unused potential of sport;
- Unadapted systems to combine sport and education;
- Challenges for sustainable sport structures:
  - Insufficient support for voluntary activity;
  - Discrepancies between developments in gambling markets and the financing of sport;
  - Inadequate protection of intellectual property rights;
- Doping as a threat to the physical and moral integrity of sportspeople;
- Discrimination in sport on grounds of nationality;
- Unused scope for improving EU-level dialogue on sport;
- Perceived lack of legal clarity regarding the application of EU law to sport;
- Insufficient information on sport for the EU-27.

This IA focuses on possible incentive measures in the field of sport. These measures may be contemplated to tackle some, but not all, of the issues, challenges and problems identified in the 2007 White Paper, the 2010 IA report, the 2011 Communication and the 2011 EU Work Plan for Sport. There are a number of problems, threats and challenges related to sport at EU level where the EU's objectives are best achieved through political co-ordination or, in some cases, legal intervention.

It is not the Commission's intention for incentive measures to intervene in areas where the European dimension of sport is best developed through non-spending measures, nor to supersede, duplicate or interfere with Member State projects or policies. Instead, the EU incentive measures should focus on those issues and fields where their added value would be significant. This is the case in particular for areas that fulfil one or more of the following conditions:

- The problems have an international dimension and cannot be tackled effectively by national actors alone, but require a degree of co-operation and co-ordination between actors at various levels;
- There are large disparities between Member States and their respective policies and approaches to specific issues or problems, and therefore a strong potential for promoting networking and the identification and exchange of good practices among (especially non-governmental) stakeholders;
- There is a lack of comprehensive, reliable, relevant and/or comparable data and information on the issue, and the weak knowledge base limits the potential for evidence-based policy-making at the EU and/or national levels;

- A lack of co-ordination of actions implemented solely by Member States may weaken the development of sport in Europe and reduce the potential of sport to contribute to the achievement of the goals defined in the Europe 2020 Strategy.

### *Main problems*

The following sections outline specific problems and challenges in five thematic areas that meet several or all of the above criteria. These areas are those where the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of EU action have been tested through the Preparatory Actions in the field of Sport, implemented in 2009, 2010 and 2011. The Evaluation report of the Preparatory Actions gives a detailed overview of the type of instruments adopted and of the ways the different problems have been addressed. It should be recalled that this Evaluation only covered in detail the first year of implementation of the Preparatory Actions; the second year was partially covered while it was not possible to cover the third year of implementation (see above section 1.4).

#### *- Weakness of sport structures resulting in poor governance*

The Commission recognises in its 2011 Communication that good governance in sport is a condition for the autonomy and self-regulation of sport organisations and it pledges to promote standards of sport governance through exchange of good practice and targeted support to specific initiatives. The 2011 Council Resolution identifies the promotion of good governance as a priority theme for the EU Work Plan on Sport together with the fight against match fixing, and it establishes an expert group with the task of developing principles of transparency concerning good governance in sport with a target date of end-2012 for an initial set of recommendations. The promotion of good governance principles should take into account the fact that sport structures around Europe rely heavily on volunteers for their functioning, particularly at grassroots level. According to a recent Commission-funded study,<sup>10</sup> sport is the biggest sector in volunteering in Europe. Beyond the general challenges to volunteering, the heavy reliance on volunteers also brings with it specific difficulties for the management of sport structures and organisations, in particular a lack of professionalism and resources, fragmentation and insufficient knowledge of complex issues.

A related horizontal problem, repeatedly highlighted at EU level and confirmed by the evaluation of the Preparatory Action in sport, is the lack of sound, accurate and comparable data and information on sport for EU-27. Developing a new policy area without such parameters is difficult and often delicate, since it has to be based on assumptions. Policy making in sport at national and EU level would considerably benefit from a better knowledge base, allowing decision-makers to take informed decisions.

#### *- Increasing social and economic costs of insufficient physical activity*

In 2007, the White Paper on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity<sup>11</sup> outlined the Commission's belief that the Member States and the EU must take pro-active steps to reverse the decline in physical activity levels in recent decades. In 2008, EU Sport Ministers informally endorsed EU Physical Activity Guidelines recommending how policies and practices at EU, national

---

<sup>10</sup> GHK for DG EAC: Volunteering in the European Union, February 2010:

[http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/news900\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/news900_en.htm)

<sup>11</sup> Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues. COM(2007) 279 final

and local levels can be used to make it easier for citizens to be physically active as part of their daily lives. A number of Member States have used them as a basis for national policy initiatives. The 2011 Communication from the Commission notes that physical activity is one of the most important health determinants in modern society and can make a major contribution to the reduction of overweight and obesity and the prevention of a number of serious diseases. The economic costs caused by lack of physical activity for health care systems through the increased burden of disease should also be mentioned in this context. In its 2011 Communication the Commission therefore commits to supporting transnational projects and networks in the area of health-enhancing physical activity. Following the Council's Resolution on an EU Work Plan for Sport, an Expert Group was set up to explore ways to promote health enhancing physical activity and participation in grassroots sport, with the identification of measures foreseen by mid-2013.

Large differences continue to exist in physical activity levels and public approaches between Member States. Physical activity could be further encouraged in national educational systems from an early age. A comparative analysis carried out in 2009 found that while most Member States have developed national policies on physical activity, the majority fail to specify the involvement of other institutions such as local authorities, NGOs, the private sector or the media.<sup>12</sup> This is a cause for concern given that municipalities and civil society organisations active at the local level are arguably the most important actors when it comes to encouraging and enabling physical activity. Although promising examples do exist, integrative cross-sectoral approaches and networks that promote physical activity throughout the lifespan are the exception rather than the norm. Such findings confirm the rationale behind 9 projects financed from the 2009 Preparatory Action in the field of sport.

Results from the evaluation of Preparatory Actions illustrate the large disparities existing among stakeholders notably at local level in pursuing strategies to increase participation in physical activity and sport and the efficiency gained in this field by sharing knowledge and good practices.

*- Unused potential for social inclusion and equal opportunities in and through sport; persistent violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport*

The results from the evaluation of Preparatory Actions in the field of sport show that the potential of sport to contribute to strengthening social cohesion and integration is beyond doubt yet it is often not fully used. Participation in organised sport is especially low among those who stand to benefit most from it socially: women, the disabled, people of low socioeconomic status and ethnic minority / immigrant populations. In addition, the persistent lack of opportunity reaches the upper echelons of sport, where people from disadvantaged groups are underrepresented. Women are underrepresented in leadership positions in sport. People with disabilities also appear to be disadvantaged in their relation to sport. All these trends are amplified among ethnic minorities and immigrants, hindering their ability to integrate into society and avoid or escape from social exclusion. Substantial and ongoing efforts are taking place to address social inclusion and sport at the governmental level. The European Strategy for Equality between Women and Men<sup>13</sup> specifically identifies a Commission role in promoting 'good practice on gender roles in youth, education, culture

---

<sup>12</sup> Daugbjerg et al: Promotion of Physical Activity in the European Region: Content Analysis of 27 National Policy Documents. Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 2009, 6, 805-817

<sup>13</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EN:PDF>

and sport'. Projects in this field tend to exist in isolation, and up to now there has been little evidence to suggest that such approaches are being shared between EU Member States, despite their potentially wide applicability for problems experienced across Europe.

The 2011 Communication from the Commission recognises that spectator violence and disorder remain a Europe-wide phenomenon and that there is a need for a European approach comprising measures designed to reduce the associated risks. Whereas EU action has so far focused on providing a high level of safety through policing at international football events, a wider approach is needed covering also other sport disciplines, focused on prevention and requiring stronger cooperation among the relevant stakeholders, such as police services, judicial authorities, sport organisations, supporters' organisations and public authorities. Moreover, violence in sport often has racist, xenophobic or homophobic undertones. Eradicating violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport requires tackling not only its symptoms, but also its root causes. This in turn requires progress in areas such as education, youth work and fan coaching, which necessitates the participation of civil society groups themselves. Until now, sport clubs, supporters groups and other such organisations have not played a large role in EU initiatives focused on curbing violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport.

*- Mismatch between high-level sports training and general education (dual careers)*

In 2008, EU Sport Ministers stated that a dual curriculum of education and sports was vital for the training of young sport professionals and high-level athletes.<sup>14</sup> The importance of this issue was also highlighted by the European Council in its 2008 Declaration on Sport.<sup>15</sup> The 2011 Council Resolution foresees the establishment of an Expert Group in charge of preparing a proposal for European guidelines on dual careers by the end of 2012.

It is furthermore increasingly recognised that the intensity of training for talented young sportspeople makes it difficult for them to pursue their (higher) education in an adequate way. As a result, ex-athletes can find themselves ill-equipped for a successful integration into the regular labour market after their sporting careers are over. The problem is especially acute in the case of athletes who practise specific sports that require extensive travel to international tournaments or are tied to specific facilities (such as winter sports), or of athletes from smaller countries that may not have adequate facilities (in sport as well as higher education), and who are therefore forced to try to take advantage of opportunities abroad. Initiatives in this field up to date have been relatively small-scale, and have so far only been able to make a limited contribution to resolving the problem that affects the future career opportunities of nearly all young elite athletes across Europe. Results of projects carried out in the framework of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport show that sport organisations, athletes, education institutions and businesses need guidance on how they can contribute to the promotion of dual careers. While many Member States make a considerable effort to continue to support their athletes once their compulsory education is over, in others athletes can be left with almost no guidance or support. Furthermore, while in a number of Member States programmes exist (either through the public authorities or through sport associations) that offer counselling, educational grants, networking, tax advantages, etc.,

---

<sup>14</sup> Declaration of the Sport Ministers of the European Union (Biarritz, 27-28 November 2008):

[http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc/b21/1128\\_final\\_statement\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc/b21/1128_final_statement_en.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Annex 5 to the Presidency Conclusions - Brussels, 11-12 December 2008:

[http://ec.europa.eu/sport/information-center/doc/timeline/european\\_council\\_12-12-2008\\_conclusions\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/information-center/doc/timeline/european_council_12-12-2008_conclusions_en.pdf)

other Member States do not seem to have any after career programmes to help former athletes integrate into the labour market.

*- Doping threatening the physical and moral integrity of amateur sportspeople*

The prevention of doping in amateur sport and fitness was highlighted recently by the informal EU Working Group on Anti-Doping as a priority for future exchange (as well as for funding under possible future EU incentive measures in the field of sport), while the general lack of reliable information on doping in amateur sport in the EU forms part of the rationale behind four projects financed from the 2010 Preparatory Action. Disparities between Member States in terms of the perceived seriousness of doping as an issue are great.<sup>16</sup> The 2011 Communication from the Commission highlights the need for support to transnational anti-doping networks, including networks focusing on preventive measures targeting amateur sport, sport for all and fitness. The fight against doping is included in the priority areas for action singled out in the Council Resolution. It should be underlined that up to date, the vast majority of attention (and resources) devoted to doping are restricted to combating its use in professional and elite sport. This is especially true at the institutional level, given the focus of the World Anti-Doping Agency and most of its national counterparts in the EU and beyond. However, there are indications that in recent years, doping practices have spread most rapidly in amateur sport and fitness centres, which fall outside the scope of anti-doping measures at international level and within many Member States.

*Main lessons learned from the evaluation*

The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport confirmed the relevance and consistency of the three types of interventions (transnational projects, special events and studies/surveys/conferences) with general EU policy objectives and the EU legal and policy framework for sport. The EU added value could be clearly demonstrated for projects and studies/surveys/conferences, while it did not realise its full potential regarding support for special events. Here, the lack of specific award criteria within a competitive and selective tendering process was identified as a key concern. Regarding the effectiveness of transnational projects the evaluation confirmed that projects achieved great success in promoting sport issues and developing the European dimension in sport, especially with regard to building and strengthening networks between partner organisations in different sectors and to kick-starting pan-European cooperation between organisations working on sport. The size and make-up of the transnational network were among the key factors positively or negatively affecting the potential project outcomes. Likewise, studies/surveys/conferences were evaluated as useful tools for the promotion of European sporting issues and for providing information. For special events, again, the lack of award criteria was mentioned as an issue. Concerning efficiency, the evaluation of transnational projects confirmed that the selection procedure was adequate, while noting that organisations which had not been previously awarded had trouble breaking through. While the management system of Preparatory Actions was considered sufficiently efficient, the report suggests that a larger sustainable programme would be more efficiently managed by an Executive Agency.

The report concluded that incentive measures supporting the policy cooperation mechanisms can be improved. For instance, the duration of transnational projects should be increased in

---

<sup>16</sup> Special Eurobarometer 213 - Citizens of the European Union and Sport

order to allow for more ambitious objectives and activities. Moreover, greater emphasis should be given on the make-up of networks, plans for project management and the expected contribution of each partner, as well as on the ultimate use of best practice collections, guidelines and the like. Incentive measures can also be improved for special events, e.g. by using a competitive process, involving transparent award criteria, or by defining requirements for event outcomes. The report saw also scope to improve synergy and interaction between the different kinds of stakeholders, e.g. by encouraging the involvement of partners representing different types of organisations. The evaluation also looked into the most effective and useful activities and the level of funding devoted to incentive measures in order to reach a critical mass of impacts cost-effectively. It states that the majority of future funding should go to transnational networking projects, while substantial amounts should be allocated to support European sport events, which have in particular been proven effective in the fields of HEPA and social inclusion, while a small amount should usefully also be employed for studies/survey/conferences. The report notes that more information and statistics are necessary for an evidence-based policy; funding mapping projects only is not considered sufficient.

### *Affected groups*

The incentive measure is intended first and foremost to benefit grassroots sport and those involved with its organisation. The following authorities, stakeholders and organisations can be directly or indirectly affected:

- Member States' public authorities (national, regional, local levels);
- International sport organisations (International Olympic Committee, international sport federations and other international sport organisations, including leagues, professional sport organisations, amateur sport organisations and leisure and outdoor activity organisations);
- European sport organisations (European Olympic Committees, European sport federations and other European sport organisations, including leagues, professional sport organisations, amateur sport organisations and leisure and outdoor activity organisations);
- National sport organisations (National Olympic Committees, confederations, federations, regional organisations, leagues, clubs etc.);
- Other European sport-related organisations (e.g. in the fields of health, education, media, sporting goods);
- International and European organisations, such as the Council of Europe, the WHO, WADA and UNESCO;
- Organisations representing employees in the sport sector;
- Organisations representing sportspeople, support staff (e.g. trainers, coaches, volunteers) and supporters;
- Citizens at large (e.g. minority groups, pupils, students, seniors, etc.).

### **2.3. Baseline scenario**

There are no indications that any of the problems to be addressed will become any less pressing in the coming years. In fact, at least in some cases (such as doping), the magnitude of the problem will almost certainly continue to grow. Without incentive measures to provide



funding for sport-specific measures or projects at EU level, the various problems would continue to be addressed primarily at the national level. In this scenario, it is likely that some Member States will make progress in addressing the various challenges related to sport and its social and economic role. Most Member States have adopted explicit policies, strategies and/or action plans for sport-related physical activity promotion, and some have recently become active in specific areas such as dual careers. However, progress will continue to be highly uneven.

By way of example, recent figures and information confirm such trends with regard to health-enhancing physical activity, especially in light of health prevention (e.g. to address obesity, other resulting chronic diseases, and active ageing). The 2010 Eurobarometer<sup>17</sup> showed that in seven Member States (Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Ireland, Slovenia, the Netherlands and Luxembourg), more than half of the adults surveyed play sport at least once a week. At the other end of the spectrum, more than half of respondents from four Member States (Greece, Bulgaria, Portugal and Italy) say they never play any sport at all.<sup>18</sup> As regards physical activity trends among children, recent figures from the OECD<sup>19</sup> show that the percentage of children aged 11 years who do moderate-to-vigorous physical activity on a daily basis ranged from more than 40% in some Member States (Slovak Republic, Ireland and Finland) to less than 20% in others (France, Italy and Luxembourg). The same study confirms that more than half of the total adult population across the EU are now overweight or obese, which is also true in 15 of 27 EU Member States. The rate of obesity has more than doubled over the past 20 years in most EU countries for which data are available. The rapid increase occurred regardless of what the levels of obesity were two decades ago. Because obesity is associated with higher risks of chronic illnesses, it is linked to significant additional health care costs. A recent study in England estimated that total costs linked to overweight and obesity could increase by as much as 70% between 2007 and 2015, and be 2.4 times higher by 2025. It is very likely that EU countries continue their tendency to focus health spending on treating the ill, instead of doing more to prevent illness, such as promoting physical activity. Only around 3% of current health expenditure is spent on prevention and public health programmes on average. Health expenditure has risen in all European countries, often increasing at a faster rate than economic growth. Moreover, in many countries, the recent economic downturn can be expected to continue to result in a marked increase in the ratio of health spending to GDP.

In the field of dual careers, a recent EU-funded study<sup>20</sup> found significant differences between Member States, sport associations and sport centres in terms of how the academic education of young athletes is regulated and facilitated. For example, some countries try to favour the combination of sports training and school success by creating sports classes or schools, or by allowing high level athletes to benefit from a special status. Some sport associations oblige young athletes to follow studies while practising sports beyond the mandatory age at which it is possible to leave school. Certain sport centres use different means to encourage young people to follow studies until secondary school by combining sports training and courses (e.g.

---

<sup>17</sup> See above footnote 15

<sup>18</sup> The rates for participation in “informal” physical exercise (such as cycling, walking, dancing or gardening) broadly mirror these trends, although there are notable exceptions (such as the case of Bulgaria, where the low participation rates in sport seem to be partially offset by quite high rates of informal physical activity).

<sup>19</sup> OECD (2010), *Health at a Glance: Europe 2010*, OECD Publishing.

<sup>20</sup> Study on training of young sportsmen/women in Europe, TAJ, 2008.

[http://ec.europa.eu/sport/pdf/doc507\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/pdf/doc507_en.pdf)

through individual study programmes or mentoring, distance learning, flexibility with a view to the timing of exams). The study also showed that while many Member States make a considerable effort to continue to support their athletes once their compulsory education is over, in others athletes can be left with almost no guidance or support. Furthermore, while in a number of Member States programmes exist (either through the public authorities or through sport associations) that offer counselling, educational grants, networking, tax advantages, etc., several other Member States do not seem to have any after career programmes to help former athletes integrate into the labour market. These differences show that there is a need for further action at the EU level, in particular as the difficulties faced by talented young athletes with a view to their future employability are particularly hard to overcome for those who train and compete (or would like to train and compete) outside of their home country.

Exogenous developments affecting the EU's population growth should also be mentioned in this context. Recent Eurobarometer surveys have shown that the majority of Europeans exercise or play sport very infrequently or even never.<sup>21</sup> This is a serious cause for concern, especially in view of the fact that most European societies are ageing rapidly. Over the next 20 years, the number of Europeans aged over 65 is expected to rise by 45%, from 85 million in 2008 to 123 million in 2030.<sup>22</sup> This will put a severe strain on the economy, society and the sustainability of public finances; on the basis of current policies, age-related public expenditure in the EU is projected to increase by EUR 126 billion (equivalent to approx. 4.7% of GDP) by 2060. In order to mitigate the negative effects of the ageing population, policies are needed to improve the health status and quality of life of European citizens and of older people in particular. Physical activity is one of the key factors that can contribute significantly not only to healthy and active ageing, but also to a healthy workforce. For example, a recent study<sup>23</sup> calculated that in Denmark, physical inactivity is directly responsible for approximately 1.1 days of sick leave per worker each year.

Without incentive measures, EU action in the two areas highlighted here above and in the other areas identified in section 2.2 will be mostly limited to policy co-ordination between Member State governments and stakeholders at EU level. As noted in the 2011 Communication, EU-level co-operation and structured dialogue on sport could be greatly enhanced following the 2007 White Paper. Today they take place primarily through the formal structures for sport in the Council and the new Expert Groups, the EU Sport Forum and informal EU Sport Ministers and Sport Directors meetings. However, since the political dialogue at EU level is generally limited to representatives of the national governments of Member States, it can only include, take into account, reach or affect relevant non-governmental actors, or regional and local level authorities, to a very limited extent – especially if the participating Member States do not attach high political priority to the issues being discussed and if no dialogue on EU sport matters takes place at national level. In order to directly engage and link relevant actors from civil society and the lower levels of

---

<sup>21</sup> In 2009, respondents answered the question “How often do you exercise or play sport?” as follows: 39% never; 21% seldom; 31% with some regularity; and 9% regularly. Special Eurobarometer 334: Sport and Physical Activity. March 2010.

<sup>22</sup> European Commission: Ageing Report 2009. URL: [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/publications/publication14992\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/publication14992_en.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> *Risikofaktorer og folkesundhed i Danmark. [Risk factors and public health in Denmark]*. Copenhagen, Statens Institut for Folkesundhed, 2006. English summary available at: [http://www.si-folkesundhed.dk/upload/2745\\_risk\\_factors\\_and\\_public\\_health\\_in\\_denmark.pdf](http://www.si-folkesundhed.dk/upload/2745_risk_factors_and_public_health_in_denmark.pdf)

government, and facilitate meaningful exchange and collaboration between them, a certain level of financial support is generally required.

Without specific incentive measures in the field of sport, effective solutions to the problems outlined previously may well be developed in certain countries, local communities, or organisations. In most cases, solutions are likely to remain localised, and have no significant effect on the identified wider problem areas across the EU. As a result, the overall gravity of the problems would probably remain unchanged. In some cases, a certain level of transnational co-operation and networking could also be funded through existing EU programmes; this is however limited to some specific fields of intervention and never specifically designed to benefit grassroots sport. The funding of sport activities is rather used as a tool to meet objectives of such programmes. For instance, the scope of the Erasmus and Comenius sub-programmes is too limited to address the specific problems in sport and education; the EU health strategy and related instruments address physical activity from a broader, nutrition-led perspective and not on its own value, missing out on the potential and relevance of the sport sector to address the physical inactivity deficit. Overall, progress in some places and areas could be offset by a worsening of the situation elsewhere, and the potential for joint problem solving, mutual learning and an extension of good practices would be lost.

#### **2.4. Justification for EU intervention and EU added value**

EU action in the field of sport is linked to Article 165 TFEU, which gives the EU a supporting competence and authorises it to “contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues” by taking action aimed at “developing the European dimension in sport”. The Treaty further stipulates that incentive measures and policy recommendations are the main instruments at the EU’s disposal in order to achieve this. Any EU intervention in the field of sport should respect the principle of subsidiarity. This principle is enshrined in Article 6 TFEU, which stipulates that the EU should support, coordinate or supplement the actions of Member States in the field of sport.

As has been demonstrated in the preceding sections, all of the problems that the incentive measures are intended to tackle have a significant transnational dimension. Sport in Europe is often organised on a continental level: European sporting competitions, events and organisations play a significant role and increasing numbers of young athletes train and compete in countries other than their own. As shown by the results of the evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport, co-operation and co-ordination between actors from different Member States is therefore required to tackle the different problems facing sport across the EU. The international dimension also relates to the pursuit of key EU policy objectives to which sport has a great potential to contribute, namely competitiveness, employability, health promotion, disease prevention and social cohesion. Furthermore, EU incentive measures are necessary to strengthen and develop the European dimension in sport as mandated in the Treaty.

In many cases, activities to address the problems identified already take place at the national and sometimes regional or local level. The EU incentive measures are not meant to replace or duplicate these efforts. However, as shown in the previous sections and as testified by

projects carried out in the framework of the Preparatory Actions<sup>24</sup>, there are significant discrepancies between Member States<sup>25</sup> not only in terms of the level of political priority attached to the problems, but also in the methods and tools that are used to address them. In some cases, effective initiatives have been developed at the national or sub-national level (by specific sport organisations or local communities), but unless these are shared and discussed widely, the risk is that others across Europe waste efforts and scarce resources on “reinventing the wheel” or, even worse, pursuing approaches that have already proven to be ineffective elsewhere. There are therefore significant potential benefits to be reaped from helping Member States, local authorities and communities, sport associations and other relevant stakeholders to co-ordinate and join their efforts to better tackle the problems identified.

Thus, the EU added value of the incentive measures lies mainly in generating, sharing and disseminating information, data and knowledge between the numerous relevant actors. Without EU support, these actors would not exchange good practices identified in a national setting and tend to address similar problems in a fragmented and disconnected way. Collaboration and networking between them will lead to the extension of best practices, in particular innovative and integrated approaches, building for instance on innovative partnerships. This will not only improve the effectiveness and efficiency of concrete measures when compared with action by Member States alone, but also improve the conditions for more evidence-based policy making in the field of sport at all levels (EU, national and sub-national). The main findings of the evaluation of the Preparatory Actions point out that the supported transnational cooperation projects demonstrated EU added value in a number of diverse ways, including taking steps to ameliorate discrepancies between Member States, spreading best practices, testing the viability of networks in given subjects and providing policy support through research.

### **3. OBJECTIVES**

The proposed incentive measures are aimed at supporting EU level cooperation in the field of sport, as defined by the 2011 Commission Communication and Council Resolution, in a limited number of areas where EU financial intervention would bring added value to policy co-ordination. They also aim at improving the framework conditions under which sport takes place in the EU and tackling problems and challenges that currently keep it from fulfilling its full social and economic potential. They are thus fully in line with the Europe 2020 Strategy,<sup>26</sup> which pursues the aim of turning the EU into a “smart, sustainable and inclusive economy delivering high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion”. They are based on Article 165 of the TFEU which calls on the EU to contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues and to the development of the European dimension in sport, by e.g. promoting fairness and openness in sport and protecting the physical and moral integrity of sportspeople. The incentive measures seek to co-ordinate, support and supplement the action of the Member States. In doing so, the incentive measures seek to address the key problems identified in the previous section by pursuing the following objectives:

---

<sup>24</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/doc/evaluation\\_final\\_report\\_prepact\\_special\\_events\\_20110727.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/doc/evaluation_final_report_prepact_special_events_20110727.pdf)

<sup>25</sup> Detailed examples for discrepancies between Member States are provided per intervention area in the problem section.

<sup>26</sup> COM (2010) 2020 final

## General objective \*

To develop the European dimension in sport

## Specific objectives

1. To promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity
2. To promote health-enhancing physical activity and increased participation in sport
3. To exploit the potential of sport to foster social inclusion, ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport
4. To improve the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers
5. To contribute to the fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport

## Operational objectives

- 1.1 To support capacity building in sport
- 1.2 To support transnational projects aimed at benchmarking good governance in European sport
- 1.3 To support the strengthening of the evidence base for policy making
- 2.1 To promote cross-sectoral exchanges and transnational projects supporting the implementation of EU Physical Activity Guidelines
- 2.2 To support non-commercial European sport events of major importance aimed at promoting participation in sport and HEPA
- 3.1 To support transnational projects on social inclusion based on mutual learning among stakeholders
- 3.2 To support transnational projects for the advancement of women in leadership positions in sport based on the EU Gender Equality Strategy
- 3.3 To support transnational projects for participation in sport of people with disabilities based on the EU Disability Strategy
- 3.4 To support transnational projects for the development of innovative approaches to contain violence and give guidance on how to tackle racism in and through sport
- 3.5 To support non-commercial European sport events of major importance
- 4.1 To promote cross-sectoral exchanges and transnational projects supporting the implementation of EU Guidelines on Dual Careers
- 5.1 To support transnational projects on the benchmarking of best practices in combating doping at grassroots level

\* The proposed general objective exclusively refers to the sport-related activities of the single Education, Training, Youth and Sport programme. However, it is fully in line and contributes to the overall general objective of the single programme "to contribute to the objectives of the EU 2020 strategy and of the Education and Training strategic framework 2020 (ET 2020), including the corresponding targets, to the renewed framework for European Cooperation in Youth field (2010-2018), to the sustainable development of third countries in the field of higher education and to develop the European dimension in sport".

#### **4. POLICY OPTIONS**

As has been explained previously, this IA focuses exclusively on possible incentive measures in the field of sport. Other policy options (in particular concerning policy co-ordination and co-operation) have been discussed extensively in the IA accompanying the 2011 Communication on sport, which found that the most appropriate option to implement the Lisbon Treaty provisions in the field of sport was to define a strategic medium-term framework for cooperation in sport, based on a new EU agenda for sport, and leaving to a further Impact Assessment (the current report) the analysis of the impact of possible incentive measures in the field of sport.

Therefore, given the current stage in the policy development process, and the fact that the possibility of incentive measures is explicitly mentioned in Article 165 TFEU, the way the options are defined for this IA is kept simple. The alternatives that are considered mainly relate to the architecture of the future incentive measures in the field of sport.

##### **4.1. Policy Option 1: "No further EU action" (baseline scenario)**

Considered as the baseline scenario, this option would consist in having no incentive measures specifically devoted to sport. EU intervention in the field of sport would be limited to policy co-ordination. Some sport-related projects may be funded by mainstreaming sport into other expenditure programmes and funds that address closely related areas. It should be noted that this option would represent a step back from the current situation where specific funding for sport is made available, albeit with limited budgetary resources, through the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport, which will be discontinued after 2011. Since policy option 1 coincides with the baseline scenario, its description is presented above in section 2.3.

##### **4.2. Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"**

Under this option, future incentive measures in the field of sport would take the form of a stand-alone EU Sport Programme disposing of a budget ranging between €20 and 50 million per year<sup>27</sup>. The Sport Programme would be aimed at accompanying the current policy co-operation framework defined by the 2011 Communication from the Commission and ensuing Council Resolution. It would be flexible enough to allow for future adjustments in terms of

---

<sup>27</sup> The evaluation of Preparatory Actions and Special Events in the field of sport in 2009-2010 concludes that an annual level of funding of approximately €20 million is considered the minimum amount that should be made available for incentive measures in order to achieve a critical mass of impacts. See also section 6.2 below.

budget allocation, type of actions and priority areas to be addressed in order to take into account changes in priorities and new developments in the policy field.

A separate Sport Programme would facilitate the generation, exchange and dissemination of knowledge and good practices in the fields identified, and raise awareness of key issues. It would also build the evidence-base for policy making, and provide capacity building for sport organisations.

In order to address the general and specific objectives set out in the preceding section, the Sport Programme would need to be composed of different instruments targeting the various problem areas through appropriate mechanisms. The choice of these instruments takes account of the results of the evaluation of the Preparatory Actions, the experience gathered over the past decade in EU level cooperation in sport and the consultation outcomes. The table hereafter identifies four main types of instruments for this policy option, including those three types (support to transnational cooperation projects and networks; support to non-commercial sport events of major importance; and support to evidence-based policy tools such as studies, conferences and surveys) used to implement the Preparatory Actions and Special Events in the field of sport. Targeted capacity building has been added as the fourth instrument. A rationale for the use of these instruments with regard to their efficiency, their EU added value and their effectiveness in reaching the objectives of the initiative is provided in **Annex II**.

Based on the analysis carried out in Annex II, the Sport Programme would be structured as follows:

- In order to promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity, the incentive measures would support actions to strengthen the evidence base for policy making (such as studies and conferences), and provide capacity building for sport organisations (in the form of targeted support through training, benchmarking, or twinning).
- In order to contribute to achieving the other four specific objectives, transnational cooperation projects and the strengthening of the knowledge base would be supported in order to facilitate networking, the generation, exchange and dissemination of knowledge and good practices, and awareness-raising of key issues.
- Support for non-commercial European sport events of major importance would be considered provided the event could realistically be expected to make a contribution to promoting participation in health-enhancing physical activity, social inclusion and equal opportunities, or the fight against violence and intolerance. Such events could also contribute to the visibility of the EU, and thereby to developing the European dimension in sport.

The management of the Sport Programme would be in centralised mode, mainly through EACEA. In view of the limited scale of the measures and the type of projects that are envisaged, the Programme could not be managed by national agencies.

It should finally be noted that it would not be possible to proactively analyse the distributional impacts of the envisaged measures for different Member States since the proposed Sport Programme is intended to cover the EU as a whole and no earmarking of

funds for specific countries or region is foreseen. The European character of the proposed measures will ensure that all areas of the EU are adequately covered. Applications submitted for the 2009 and 2010 calls for proposals under the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport came from practically all EU countries and the selected projects covered almost all EU territories.

#### **4.3. Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport"**

Under option 3, future incentive measures in the field of sport would be managed as part of the "Education Europe" programme as referred to in the Commission's Communication COM/2011/500 of 29/6/2011 entitled "A Budget for Europe 2020". A specific chapter for sport, in the form of a sub-programme, and a budget for sport activities would avoid a proliferation of individual legal bases – in line with the overall MFF approach towards streamlining and simplification - whilst still exploiting both the common general objectives and the potential for economies of scale and harmonisation of administrative and management procedures. The instruments to be analysed as part of the Sport sub-programme would be the same as the ones defined in policy option 2.

The main rationale of the incentive measures for sport is to provide specific support to organisations and bodies (not to individuals as final beneficiaries) to strengthen cooperation, facilitate the exchange of good practices and raise awareness of a number of issues related to the practice of sport and of sport's contribution to address social and economic challenges. There are no areas where the proposed incentive measures would overlap with actions foreseen in the main programme<sup>28</sup>. The proposed measures aim at reaching out to grassroots sport organisations, which are generally not part of the education, training and youth sectors.

For this reason, the proposed incentive measures would maintain their specificity as a sub-programme, notably in terms of objectives, budget, implementing mechanisms and final beneficiaries. Sport actions within the Education programme could however also benefit from the existing delivery mechanisms, allowing economies of scale (with respect to creating a new, separate sport programme) and the use of good practices.

The management of the proposed incentive measures would be in centralised mode, mainly through EACEA. In view of the limited scale of the measures and the type of projects that are envisaged, the sub-programme could not be managed by national agencies. EU support would be awarded on the principle of co-funding, notably through innovative partnerships. The new sub-programme would also benefit from the continuity of existing management structures and know-how of the education programme.

#### **4.4. Option discarded at an early stage:**

**Policy Option 4: "New stand-alone Sport Programme accompanied by reinforced policy co-operation based on the creation of an Open Method of Coordination (OMC)"**

---

<sup>28</sup> With the partial and limited exception of Specific Objective 5, when it comes to improving the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers.



Under this option, the future EU Sport Programme would serve to accompany a reinforced policy co-operation framework based on a long-term strategy and on the creation of a formalised Open Method of Coordination (OMC). Compared to the structure of the Programme defined in options 2 and 3, the structure and scope of incentive measures intended to implement an OMC would need to be enlarged in order to take into account the additional topics and issues that may be addressed at policy level by the Member States and the Commission.

This option has been discarded at an early stage.

It should be noted that the establishment of an OMC for sport was examined in the 2010 Impact Assessment accompanying the 2011 Communication from the Commission.

That analysis found that the OMC option, allowing for an EU framework coordinating Member States' policies would allow for a very effective attainment of strategic objectives in the field of sports policy due to its long-term basis. The proposed introduction of an OMC in selected areas would however depend on Member States' priorities and be most relevant for areas where a high degree of consensus among the Member States existed. In any case, the analysis found that for many areas identified in the consultation process and which should be addressed by the planned initiative, no sufficient basis existed to establish a review and coordination mechanism, and certainly not in the short term. The analysis also identified areas where an OMC would not be an adequate tool, such as sport governance.

Since that Impact Assessment was carried out in September 2010, the results of its analysis can be considered valid for this report as well. It would be premature to establish an OMC for a new policy area such as sport. The Council Resolution adopted in May 2011 does not mention the OMC as an appropriate method of work for EU cooperation in the field of sport, preferring the more flexible option of adopting a three-year Work Plan for sport at EU level.

The results of these choices made at policy level should be reflected in the examination of the options to be implemented at the level of incentive measures. As a consequence, the idea of establishing a (possibly enlarged) Sport Programme as a tool to implement an OMC in the field of sport should be discarded as equally premature at this stage.

## **5. ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS**

### **5.1. Social impacts**

#### *Policy Option 1: "No further EU action" (baseline scenario)*

Activities carried out on the basis of the policy framework launched by the White Paper on Sport and reinforced by the 2011 Commission Communication and Council Resolution have forged more regular and structured cooperation on sport at EU level, on the basis of which a number of topics can be addressed more efficiently than in the past. The continuation of these activities under the EU Work Plan for Sport until 2014 is likely to improve the level of policy coordination. The social impact of policy option 1 is likely to be positive. The 2010 IA report accompanying the 2011 Communication found that, regarding social impact, policy action aimed at increased levels of *physical activity* along the concept of health-enhancing physical activity as well as stronger links between the *education* and sport sectors would have a positive impact on public health and can lead to a healthier society. Regarding *education* and

training, the IA report found that support for developing a dual career environment could positively affect the transition of talented athletes into labour markets. The report found that the preferred option also had the potential to indirectly contribute to greater *equality in society*, in particular regarding women, people with disabilities and other minority groups.

However, this process has intrinsic limitations since it mainly concerns representatives of national governments and only (very) indirectly local authorities and sports stakeholders who are the main driver for changes affecting the wider population through actions undertaken in the field of sport.

It is also likely that without implementing EU incentive measures in the field of sport, each government would continue to pursue its own strategy with EU coordination limited at political level, as highlighted above, and with existing discrepancies in the social impact generated by sport likely to increase at grassroots level across Member States.

*Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"*

Incentive measures in the field of sport that address the five subject areas defined by the problems and specific objectives discussed in sections 2 and 3, respectively, have a strong potential to generate a number of significant additional social benefits for a range of groups, if compared with policy option 1, which remains limited to rather high-level policy coordination. This would represent a net gain in relation to the baseline scenario. The way in which these benefits are generated, and the main groups that are affected in each case, are summarised in the following table:

**Table 3: Social impacts**

<b>Intervention area</b>	<b>Short-term results</b>	<b>Medium-term outcomes</b>	<b>Longer-term social impacts</b>	<b>Affected groups</b>
Sport governance	Enhanced capacity of sport structures to play a social and educational role	Greater respect for the principle of governance in sport structures (democracy, transparency, accountability, inclusiveness)	Greater and more effective involvement of stakeholders in sport policy-making	Sport organisations, associations and federations
Health-enhancing physical activity	Stakeholders able to more effectively promote health-enhancing physical activity	Enhanced participation rates in sport and health-enhancing physical activity	Improved public health, especially among those who are currently not physically active	Society at large (in particular those who are currently not physically active)
Social inclusion	Stakeholders able to more effectively ensure equal opportunities in sport and engage specific disadvantaged groups	Enhanced participation in sport by disadvantaged or vulnerable groups for which it is currently low	Greater equality of access to sport Greater social cohesion through inclusion of vulnerable groups	Disadvantaged groups, in particular women, people with disabilities, lower socio-economic groups, ethnic minorities and migrants
Fight against violence, racism and other forms of intolerance	Stakeholders able to more effectively prevent / curb violence, racism and intolerance at sport events	Lower frequency and intensity of violent incidents at sport events Reduced incidence of racist or other abuse towards sportspeople and spectators	Less crime, improved security and greater respect for equality and fundamental rights in general	Spectators and athletes at sport events  Athletes, clubs, ethnic minorities and other groups vulnerable to intolerance on and around the sport fields
Education and training (dual careers)	Stakeholders able to more effectively balance the quality of education and sport training for young athletes	Better access to quality education and/or career services for young athletes	Greater employability of former elite athletes	Young (former) elite athletes
Fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport	Stakeholders able to more effectively combat doping in amateur sport and fitness	Reduced use of doping substances in amateur sport and fitness centres	Improved health and safety of amateur sportspeople	Amateur sportspeople and users of fitness centres

Generally speaking, the incentive measures will in first instance support stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) to enable them to cooperate in identifying, developing, sharing and/or implementing solutions to the different challenges and problems to be tackled. As a result of the knowledge generated, experience exchanged, and/or awareness raised, these stakeholders can be expected to adapt their approaches, launch activities and/or influence policies that contribute to producing a number of medium-term outcomes for the respective target groups, such as higher participation rates in sport or a reduced use of doping substances. These will in turn lead to wider social benefits, such as improved public health. However it should be underlined that the intended medium-term outcomes, to which the proposed measures will contribute, as well as the long-term social impacts both depend on a considerable extent on various external factors and as a consequence they can only be influenced by the proposed measures to a limited extent.

The wider social impacts of the incentive measures can be summarised as follows:

- Greater and more effective involvement of stakeholders in sport policy-making and better governance of sport bodies;
- Improved public health (in particular concerning overweight and obesity and related diseases) due to greater participation in sport and physical activity;
- Greater social cohesion due to increased participation in sport of individuals or groups that are vulnerable to social exclusion;
- Greater security for spectators and athletes of sport events and competitions through the prevention of incidents of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance, which also contributes to the fight against these phenomena in society more generally due to the high popularity and visibility of sports;
- Better employability of former athletes due to better access to quality education that is compatible with their sport training, as well as career counselling and other supporting measures;
- Improved health and safety of amateur sportspeople due to a reduced use of doping substances.

The causal relationship between the desired medium-term outcomes and the longer-term social impacts is solid in all cases. For example, the positive effects of physical activity on health,<sup>29</sup> or of education on employability, have been proven beyond doubt in numerous studies. The occurrence of any significant unintended social impacts (positive or negative) is very unlikely. Although support for sport-related activities could facilitate growth in the sport sector, the nature of the envisaged support means that this would be on a relatively small

---

<sup>29</sup> For example, a recent review states that there is now strong evidence showing that physical activity has beneficial effects on the pathogenesis of all important metabolic syndrome-specific disorders (insulin resistance, type 2 diabetes, dyslipidemia, hypertension and obesity), all important heart and vascular diseases (coronary heart disease, chronic heart failure, intermittent claudication), and osteoporosis. Pedersen B.K., Saltin B., Evidence for Prescribing Exercise as Therapy in Chronic Disease. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 2006, 16(Suppl. 1):3–63.

scale and unlikely to lead to significant job creation, or otherwise affect employment, labour markets or job quality in the sport sector.

*Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport"*

No significant differences are expected compared to option 2.

## **5.2. Economic impacts**

*Policy Option 1: "No further EU action" (baseline scenario)*

Activities carried out on the basis of policy cooperation are likely to have a mostly indirect economic impact. The main field where economic benefits are to be expected is improved public health thanks to increased participation in physical activity. However, as shown above in section 2.2.2, this is one of the areas where differences among Member States are important and where political cooperation alone is not sufficient to trigger significant knock-on effects on society. Therefore the baseline scenario is likely to generate noteworthy economic impacts, albeit limited in scope as far as policy coordination alone does not necessarily involve grassroots players in the implementation of agreed guidelines and policies.

Like for social impacts, it should be underlined that without implementing EU incentive measures in the field of sport, each government would continue to pursue its own strategy with EU coordination limited at political level and that the economic benefits to be expected by reinforcing participation in physical activity and sport are likely to diverge among Member States.

*Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"*

In addition to the social benefits, the incentive measures can also be expected to generate longer-term economic benefits, mainly insofar as the public health benefits of increased participation rates in sport and physical activity help to reduce the direct (health care) and indirect (output lost because of illness, disease-related work disabilities and premature death) economic costs of physical inactivity. If compared with the baseline scenario, policy option 2 would trigger a higher level of involvement of interested stakeholders in the implementation of policies in the field of health-enhancing physical activity thus representing a net gain in terms of positive economic impacts generated.

As noted previously, support for sport-related activities could facilitate growth in the sport sector, insofar as certain projects might improve the framework conditions under which the sector operates. An increased participation in sport could also strengthen demand for the products and services offered by the sport sector. However, due to the type and scope of the envisaged incentive measures, any such effects are likely to be small in relation to the size of the industry, which has been estimated to generate around 2% of global GDP.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, significant impacts on competitiveness, trade and investment flows, or the conduct of businesses, are highly unlikely.

---

<sup>30</sup> World Economic Forum, Davos, 2009

The economic costs of the incentive measures relate exclusively to the direct fiscal cost to the EU budget. It should be kept in mind that EU support is awarded on the basis of the principle of co-funding, meaning that a proportion of the cost of the activities will have to be borne by other actors, which might include local, regional or national governments of Member States.

Neither of the options will bring with it any additional administrative burden on businesses, citizens or public administrations, with the exception that beneficiaries of EU funding will have to comply with certain obligations to provide information when drafting project applications and as part of the reporting on the progress and completion of projects. The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport has shown that beneficiaries perceive the administrative burden as relatively light. Administrative costs for beneficiaries will be kept to a minimum, whilst due account will have to be taken of external factors notably the general requirements on the implementation of the EU budget laid down in the Financial Regulation.

*Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport"*

No significant differences are expected compared to option 2.

### **5.3. Environmental impacts**

The White Paper on Sport illustrated that sport activities, in particular large-scale sport events, have an environmental impact. For example, sport events can have significant impacts on the use of natural resources and generation of waste. The White Paper encouraged the “greening” of sport especially through environmentally sound management, inter alia through the participation of sport organisations and sport event organisers in the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS). However, the specific activities that could be supported through incentive measures per se under Options 2 and 3 will not have an effect on the environmental footprint of sport, and therefore any significant (positive or negative) environmental impacts are highly unlikely. Potential negative impacts on the environment from a greater participation in sport due to transportation or land use for sport sites should be balanced by positive effects on the environment as a result of the implementation of projects aimed at encouraging people to walk or cycle to work as part of HEPA-related policies. Nonetheless, the potential ecological implications of any specific projects or events would be duly considered when evaluating applications for funding.

### **5.4. Impacts on fundamental rights and third countries**

Policy options 2 and 3 would have a positive impact on the promotion of equality and respect for fundamental rights, including human dignity, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, non-discrimination, equality between men and women, rights of the child and integration of persons with disabilities.

Any significant impact on third country nationals is unlikely, except insofar as a limited proportion of the incentive measures funded could benefit organisations and / or individuals from European countries that are not in the EU, notably from candidate countries and potential candidates.

## 5.5. Summary of key impacts

The table below summarises the key impacts (in comparison to the baseline scenario) of both Options 2 and 3, lists which instruments will mainly contribute to their generation, and estimates the magnitude of the impacts, and the likelihood that they will materialise. It should be noted that the estimated *magnitude* depends not only on the level of investment foreseen, but is also inversely related to the scale of the problem. Impacts are expected to be much more significant with regard to a very concrete problem that affects a limited number of individuals – such as the employability of athletes – than with regard to highly complex problems that have many dimensions and affect large parts of the population – such as public health. The *likelihood* of the impacts occurring is related primarily to the considerations outlined under effectiveness in section 6 of this report, i.e. how likely the different instruments that are envisaged are to contribute to achieving the various specific objectives, which in turn generate the social and economic impacts as discussed in section 5.1.

**Table 4 – Overview of key impacts of Options 2 and 3 (net changes in comparison to the baseline)**

Type of impacts	Impact	Key instruments to generate the impact	Magnitude	Likelihood
Social impacts	Greater and more effective involvement of stakeholders in sport policy-making, better governance of sport bodies	Transnational projects for sport organisations to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices with a view to good governance  Targeted capacity building for sport organisations  Studies, conferences etc. to improve the evidence base for sport policy-making	Very significant	Certain
	Improved public health (in particular concerning overweight and obesity and related diseases) due to greater participation in sport and physical activity	Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices in HEPA  European sport events to motivate citizens (especially young people) to be more active	Significant	Very probable
	Greater social cohesion due to increased participation in sport of individuals or groups that are vulnerable to social exclusion  Greater security for athletes and spectators of sport events and competitions, and greater respect for equality and fundamental rights in	Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices for using sport for social inclusion  European sport events to motivate citizens (especially disadvantaged groups) to be more active  Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices for combating violence and intolerance in and	Quite significant	Very probable

	general	through sport  European sport events to bring together sportspeople and spectators from across the EU		
	Better employability of former athletes due to better access to quality education that is compatible with their sport training, as well as career counselling and other supporting measures	Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices for fostering dual careers	Very significant	Probable
	Improved health and safety of amateur sportspeople due to a reduced use of doping substances	Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices for combating doping in amateur sport and fitness	Very significant	Probable
Economic impacts	Reduced direct and indirect economic costs of physical inactivity	Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices in HEPA  European sport events to motivate citizens (especially young people) to be more active	Significant	Very probable
	Direct cost to the EU budget	All instruments	€ 20 to 50 million per year	Certain
Environmental impacts	No significant environmental impacts		N/A	N/A
Impact on fundamental rights	Positive impact	Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices for using sport for social inclusion  European sport events to motivate citizens (especially disadvantaged groups) to be more active  Transnational projects for stakeholders to identify, develop, share, disseminate and implement good practices for combating violence and intolerance in and through sport  European sport events to bring together sportspeople and spectators from across the EU	Significant	Probable



Impact on third countries	No significant impact on third country nationals		N/A	N/A
---------------------------	--	--	-----	-----

## 6. COMPARING THE OPTIONS

This section compares the different options based on their effectiveness, as well as their efficiency and coherence with overarching objectives of EU policy.

## Comparison of options

**Table 5: Comparison of options**

Legend:

	++	+	0	-	--
<i>Impact compared with baseline scenario</i>	<i>positive</i>	<i>slightly positive</i>	<i>neutral</i>	<i>slightly negative</i>	<i>negative</i>

	<b>Option 1 (no further EU action)</b>	<b>Option 2 (New stand- alone Sport Programme)</b>	<b>Option 3 (Sport sub- programme as part of a single Programme)</b>	
<b>Effectiveness in terms of achieving objectives:</b>				
Objective 1 – good governance and volunteering	0	++	++	<p><i>Policy Option 1: "No further EU action"</i></p> <p>As noted in section 2.4 above, without sport-specific funding EU intervention would be limited to policy co-ordination and mainstreaming through other funding programmes. In the current programming period (2007-2013), some transnational projects have been funded that address specific objectives nr 2 and 3. No instrument is currently available to provide EU support for projects that address the remaining three objectives, namely in the fields of good governance, dual careers and doping. There are no indications that this situation is likely to change. The assumption therefore has to be that no support for projects to address these objectives will be available in the future at EU level without specific incentive measures in the field of sport.</p> <p>It should be noted that activities to address the above mentioned objectives are currently undertaken at the national level and that this is likely to continue in the future. However, as shown in the description of the identified problem areas, discrepancies among Member States are expected to widen if there is no co-operation (or only co-operation regarding policy aspects) at EU level. In addition, synergies and mutual learning are unlikely to be gained without EU action through incentive measures, thus greatly reducing the effectiveness of the actions undertaken individually by Member States.</p> <p><i>Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"</i></p> <p>The analysis of the effectiveness of incentive measures in the field of sport taking the form of a stand-alone Sport Programme is based on the analysis of the effectiveness of the different instruments which are proposed as part of the Programme (see Annex II). Based on the results of this analysis, a stand-alone Sport Programme would be more effective than the baseline scenario in achieving the five specific objectives set out in chapter 3 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Transnational cooperation projects have the potential to effectively address all the specific objectives in</li> </ul>
Objective 2 – physical activity and participation	0	++	++	
Objective 3 – equal opportunities, social inclusion and fight against violence and intolerance	0	++	++	
Objective 4 – dual careers	0	++	++	
Objective 5 – fight against doping	0	++	++	

				<p>particular by promoting networking, exchanges of good practices, cross sector innovative partnerships, mutual learning and awareness raising campaigns;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Support for non- commercial events of major European importance would be effective in addressing specific objectives 2 and 3 by increasing participation in sport, notably of people from disadvantaged groups and involving local populations;</li> <li>– Support for studies, conferences, surveys and other instruments to improve knowledge about sport at EU level would be effective in contributing to a more informed and evidence-based policy making therefore addressing all the specific objectives;</li> <li>– Capacity building actions would effectively promote the improvement of the organisation of sport stakeholder thus contributing to achieving specific objective 1.</li> </ul> <p><i>Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport"</i> The effectiveness of option 3 would be the same as that of option 2 in achieving the specific objectives presented above.</p>
<b>Efficiency/cost-effectiveness, in terms of:</b>				
Implementation costs (taking account of simplification measures);	0	+	++	<p><i>Policy Option 1: "No further EU action"</i> As explained above in section 6.1.1, option 1 is very unlikely to be effective in addressing the objectives set in chapter 3. No implementation costs would be incurred but any efficiency to be gained in terms of cost reduction would be structurally undermined by the inability of option 1 to achieve its objectives.</p>
EU budget	0	+	+	<p><i>Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"</i> As explained above in section 5.2, the only significant cost of incentive measures is the direct fiscal cost to the EU budget. Naturally, this can vary significantly for any of the options depending on the number, scale and type of measures that are supported. Compared with the baseline the costs for this option are higher, which would however be largely outweighed by the expected gains of the implemented measure and the proposed instruments, and their ability to reach the stated objectives and to generate social and economic impacts. The cost-effectiveness of the measures foreseen for the stand-alone Sport Programme is analysed in-depth in Annex II.</p> <p><i>Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport"</i> Policy options 2 and 3 share the same degree of efficiency/cost-effectiveness in this respect. In terms of implementation costs, option 3 foresees a sub-programme integrated into a larger EU Programme. This could allow achieving some economies by exploiting the synergies with existing management structures (such as the EACEA) and by streamlining processes related to the evaluation and monitoring of actions. Thus, the cost-effectiveness of this solution would seem to be somewhat higher compared to the launch of an independent Programme (option 2). Synergies and economies of scale for this option are analysed in-depth in Annex 6 to the Impact Assessment report on the Lifelong Learning Programme.</p>
<b>Administrative burden</b>	0	-	-	<p>None of the options will bring with it any additional <u>administrative burden</u> on businesses, citizens or public administrations, with the exception that, in case of policy options 2 and 3, beneficiaries of EU funding will have to comply with certain obligations to provide information when drafting project applications and as part of the reporting on the progress and completion of projects. The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions</p>

				in the field of sport has shown that beneficiaries perceive the administrative burden as relatively light. Administrative costs for beneficiaries will be kept to a minimum, whilst due account will have to be taken of external factors notably the general requirements on the implementation of the EU budget laid down in the Financial Regulation.
<b>Coherence</b> (with strategic objectives, etc.):	0	+	++	<p><i>Policy Option 1: "No further EU action"</i> Coherence should be understood as the extent to which options are coherent with the overarching objectives of EU policy. Option 1 seems not to be entirely coherent with the key objectives of the EU's sport policy insofar as political coordination would not be accompanied by support for implementation at grassroots level of agreed policies and a number of actions foreseen in the 2011 Commission's Communication and Council Resolution would either remain unrealised or be implemented in a sketchy way at national level and/or through limited mainstreaming in other EU programmes.</p> <p><i>Policy Option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"</i> <i>Policy Option 3: "A single Programme for education, training, youth and sport"</i></p> <p>Options 2 and 3 are fully coherent with the key objectives of the EU's sport policy, in that they tackle key problems identified in the Commission's 2007 White Paper and its 2011 Communication as well as the Council's 2011 Resolution. In addition, the incentive measures proposed through options 2 and 3 are also clearly coherent with the Europe 2020 Strategy (in particular its objective of "inclusive growth", i.e. fostering a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion), as well as a number of other key policy documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EU Health Strategy<sup>31</sup> highlights the importance of actions to promote health and prevent disease throughout the lifespan by tackling key issues including physical activity.</li> <li>• The Commission's Strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010-2015<sup>32</sup> states that the Commission will promote good practice on gender roles in youth, education, culture and sport.</li> <li>• The European Disability Strategy 2010-2020<sup>33</sup> commits the Commission to work to improve the accessibility of sports, leisure, cultural and recreational organisations, activities, events, venues, goods and services, and promote participation in sports events and the organisation of disability-specific ones.</li> </ul> <p>Option 3 is more consistent with the strategy of the Commission to streamline and rationalise existing EU programmes and funds with a view to creating a simpler framework for EU funding streams under the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework. Therefore, the main reason for including Sport as a sub-programme within a single programme is administrative efficiency rather than potential policy synergies.</p>

### Identification of the preferred option: option 3

---

<sup>31</sup> COM(2007) 630 final  
<sup>32</sup> COM(2010) 491 final  
<sup>33</sup> COM(2010) 636 final

## 7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

### 7.1. Framework for monitoring and evaluation

As the sport-related strand of a wider Programme, the proposed initiative will follow the general procedures designed for the new Programme. The monitoring and evaluation system will ensure that, beyond **formal evaluation, permanent monitoring** is to be developed to assess progress in achieving the set objectives.

The **evaluation** exercise will be organised mid-term and include an ex-post evaluation of the previous Preparatory Actions, Special Events and pilot projects in the field of sport and a mid-term evaluation of the new Programme, the latter having a prospective focus. Accordingly, the ex-post evaluation of the new Programme would be included in the evaluation carried out mid-term for the programme coming after the next.

A horizontal instrument will ensure the monitoring and evaluation of outputs and impacts across the abovementioned actions and instrument. The instrument will ensure in particular that the output of the actions of the incentive measures will feed into the work carried out by the 6 Expert Groups in charge of implementing the Council's EU Work Plan for Sport and the Commission's reports on the implementation of the Work Plan.

### 7.2. Indicators for future monitoring and evaluation

As a preliminary remark, it should be underlined that sport is a new area of competence for the EU. While informal cooperation structures were developed on the basis of the 2007 White Paper on Sport, EU cooperation in the field of sport remains in its infancy and has only recently been formalised.

As a consequence, EU-level data and statistics concerning the practice of sport and the sports-related problems presented in section 2 of this report are scarce. As underlined in section 4, one of the goals of future incentive measures in the field of sport will be to improve the knowledge base about sport in the EU in order to help build an informed policy in this area.

Several initiatives have been undertaken with a view to improving the collection of data in the field of sport at EU level. Work has started among a group of 12 Member States within the EU Working Group on Sport & Economics to measure the macro-economic impact of sport; this work will continue in line with the EU Work Plan for Sport adopted by the Council in its Resolution of May 2011. The Commission organised in March 2011 an EU Conference on Sport Statistics focusing on statistical and information needs in view of the development of sport as a new policy area<sup>34</sup>. A study to assess the sport sector's contribution to the Europe 2020 strategy is under way and another study will be launched in autumn 2011 on a possible future sport monitoring function in the EU aimed at analysing trends, collecting data, interpreting statistics, facilitating research, launching surveys and studies and promoting exchange of information.

Notwithstanding these efforts, no full picture for sport in the EU-27 is currently available and existing gaps are unlikely to be filled in the short term. As a consequence, the list of indicators provided in this

---

<sup>34</sup> The report and presentations from the conference are available at:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc486\\_en.htm#C6\\_Economic](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc486_en.htm#C6_Economic)

section reflects the current state of knowledge about sport at EU level. Where quantitative data are not available or impossible to determine, qualitative indicators are proposed.

The preliminary list of indicators and the potential sources of data collection for the monitoring of the Sport sub-programme are provided in the table below:

**Table 6: Monitoring indicators**

Related objective	Title	Type of Indicator	Indicator	Quantitative target	Source of data collection
<b>General objective:</b> To develop the European dimension in sport	European dimension in sport	Impact	Number of sport structures and sportspeople involved in trans-European initiatives, projects, events etc.	To be determined on the basis of further research	Monitoring data (monitoring database)
1. To promote <u>good governance</u> in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity  2. To promote <u>health-enhancing physical activity</u> and increased participation in sport  3. To exploit the potential of sport to foster <u>social inclusion</u> , ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport  4. To improve the	Co-operation and networking	Result	Extent to which EU support has enabled / strengthened co-operation and sustainable networks between relevant actors from different Member States and sectors <sup>35</sup>	To be determined on the basis of further research	Evaluation data (through questionnaires, surveys, interviews)
	Mutual learning	Result	Extent to which participants in supported initiatives have acquired knowledge that is not available in their own Member State / sector	To be determined on the basis of further research	
	Generation of relevant conclusions	Result	Extent to which supported projects, studies etc. have generated concrete evidence, recommendations and/or good practices	To be determined on the basis of further research	
	Dissemination of results	Result	Extent to which relevant actors across the EU are aware of key results of interventions receiving EU support	To be determined on the basis of further research	
	Effect on relevant policies	Result	Extent to which relevant actors have used results of projects, studies etc. receiving EU support to devise new or adapt existing policies or measures	To be determined on the basis of further research	

<sup>35</sup> Given the diverse and often complex nature of the projects and other measures envisaged to address these specific objectives, defining quantitative indicators at this stage would run the risk of oversimplification. Instead, this table proposes judgment criteria that will need to be operationalised in future evaluation exercises. This will entail the definition of appropriate indicators and relevant (mostly participatory) data collection methods. These should distinguish between the different specific objectives.

<p><u>education and training</u> of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers</p> <p>5. To contribute to the <u>fight against doping</u> in amateur and grassroots sport</p>					
<p>Operational objectives: 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.1</p> <p>(support for transnational cooperation projects)</p>	Projects supported	Output	<p>Number of applications received</p> <p>% of applications that meet minimum quality threshold</p> <p>Number of projects supported</p> <p>Number and types of organisations involved</p> <p>Number of Member States where participants are based</p> <p>Amount of funding disbursed (for all indicators: totals and per subject area, e.g. governance, HEPA...)</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>Around 450 transnational cooperation projects<sup>36</sup></p> <p>€135 million</p>	Monitoring data (monitoring database)
<p>Operational objectives: 2.2, 3.5</p> <p>(support non-</p>	Events supported	Output	<p>Number of applications received</p> <p>% of applications that meet minimum quality threshold</p> <p>Number of events supported</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>Around 100 events<sup>37</sup></p>	Monitoring data (monitoring database)

<sup>36</sup> This number is based on the assumption that the overall budgetary envelope of the Sport sub-programme will be around €210 million for the seven-year framework and that each project will receive on average an EU contribution of around €300,000

<sup>37</sup> This number is based on the assumption that the overall budgetary envelope of the Sport sub-programme will be around €210 million for the seven-year framework and that each event will receive on average an EU contribution of around €500,000



commercial European sport events of major importance)			Amount of funding disbursed Number of participating athletes Profile of participating athletes (e.g. gender, age group, geographic origin, disability) Number of spectators at event Number of EU citizens exposed to media coverage of event	€50 million To be determined on the basis of further research To be determined on the basis of further research	
Operational objective: 1.3  (support for strengthening the evidence base)	Studies / conferences supported	Output	Number of studies supported Number of conferences, seminars, workshops etc. supported Number of participants in conferences etc.  Amount of funding disbursed	Around 20 <sup>38</sup> Around 20 <sup>39</sup>  To be determined on the basis of further research €10 million	Monitoring data (monitoring database)
Operational objective: 1.1  (support for capacity building in sport)	Capacity building measures supported	Output	Number of training or other measures supported Number of sport organisations involved in capacity building measures Types of organisations supported (size, Member State, sport) Amount of funding disbursed	Around 100 <sup>40</sup>  To be determined on the basis of further research  €15 million	Monitoring data (monitoring database)

<sup>38</sup> This number is based on the assumption that the overall budgetary envelope of the Sport sub-programme will be around €210 million for the seven-year framework and that each study will cost around €250,000

<sup>39</sup> This number is based on the assumption that the overall budgetary envelope of the Sport sub-programme will be around €210 million for the seven-year framework and that each conference/seminar will cost around €250,000

<sup>40</sup> This number is based on the assumption that the overall budgetary envelope of the Sport sub-programme will be around €210 million for the seven-year framework and that each training project will receive on average an EU contribution of around €150,000

## **ANNEX I : Consultation process**

The following stakeholders and organisations have been consulted in the preparatory process for the planned initiative:

### **(a) Member States:**

- Informal meeting of EU Sport Directors (Barcelona, 25-26 February 2010);
- Informal meeting of EU Ministers responsible for sport (Madrid, 20-21 April 2010);
- First formal meeting of EU Ministers responsible for sport in the Council (Brussels, 10 May 2010), prepared by the first meeting of the Council Working Party on Sport (Brussels, 6 April 2010);
- Meetings of the informal EU Working Groups in the field of sport:
  - Member State Working Group on the White Paper on Sport (3 February 2010)
  - EU Working Group on Sport and Health (30 June 2010)
  - EU Working Group on Anti-Doping (14 January and 27 May 2010)
  - EU Working Group on Sport and Economics (10-11 June 2010)
  - EU Working Group on Non-Profit Sport Organisations (17 February 2010)
  - EU Working Group on Education and Training in Sport (19-10 May 2010)
  - EU Working Group on Social Integration and Gender Equality in Sport (8 July 2010).

### **(b) Sport stakeholders:**

- The EU Sport Forum, which constitutes the main dialogue platform between the Commission and key sport stakeholders, was organised the second time in 2010 (Madrid, 19-20 April) with discussions focussing on the implementation of the sport provisions in the Lisbon Treaty;
- Bilateral and multilateral discussions took place with targeted stakeholders such as European Sport Federations, the European Olympic Committees, other European umbrella organisations for sport, national umbrella organisations for sport, national Olympic and Paralympic committees, other actors in the field of sport at European level, social partners, and other international and European organisations such as the International Olympic Committee and international federations.

### **(c) Relevant international organisations:**

- Council of Europe;
- World Health Organisation, UNESCO.

### **(d) The general public:**

- A public on-line consultation was conducted during the second quarter of 2010 (7 April - 2 June). The online questionnaire was divided into two parts: "Addressing key challenges for sport in Europe" (Part I) and "Identifying policy priorities for EU action" (Part II). Public interest in this consultation was high and the response rate considerable (more than 1,300 valid submissions).
- In addition to the online consultation, the Commission received 48 position papers related to the consultation process, mainly from sport organisations, but also from Member States. The majority of these contributions provided high-quality input for sport-specific topics ranging from health-related issues over aspects relating to education in sport to governance questions. However, they also reflected issues that are not part of the EU's mandate as defined in Article 165 TFEU.

(e) Group of Independent Sport Experts:

Ten well-known independent experts with proven experience in the area of sport and the EU were consulted on the implementation of the new Treaty provisions on sport. The Group met twice. The final report was submitted to Commissioner Vassiliou in mid-September 2010.

## **ANNEX II : Rationale for option 2: "New stand-alone Sport Programme"**

The analysis of the effectiveness, EU added value and efficiency of different actions/instruments of option 2 has to be carried out with reference to the objectives of the planned initiative. The analysis presented hereafter substantiates how the different envisaged instruments would function and which categories of beneficiaries are expected to be the targets of the proposed measures.

The envisaged instruments are presented in the table hereafter:

#	Instrument	Brief description
A	Transnational collaborative projects	<p>EU co-funding for collaborative projects to encourage the creation of networks between relevant actors (public bodies or civil society organisations) from several different Member States, in order to develop and implement innovative approaches, and identify, share and exchange information, knowledge and good practices in specific thematic areas.</p> <p>This instrument is already being tested through the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport, implemented in 2009, 2010 and 2011. An external evaluation conducted in the first half of 2011 has provided an early indication of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of these Preparatory Actions.</p>
B	Support for non-commercial European sport events of major importance	<p>EU financial support for carefully selected sport events and competitions that do not aim to generate profits, are deemed to pursue relevant objectives, and enhance the European dimension of sport.</p> <p>Examples of events that have been supported in the past include European Youth Olympic Festivals and Special Olympic Games for mentally disabled people. An external evaluation conducted in the first half of 2011 has provided an early indication of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of support for such events.</p>
C	Support for strengthening the evidence base for policy making	<p>Studies, comparative research, statistics, surveys, conferences and publications to generate knowledge, data and information on various aspects related to sport in the EU, the challenges it faces and its economic and social impact, in order to facilitate evidence-based policy-making at European, national, regional and local levels. A limited number of studies and conferences in the field of sport have already been supported in the past few years.</p>
D	Support for capacity building in sport	<p>Any assistance that is provided to sport structures, organisations or other entities which have a need to develop specific skills or competences, or for general upgrading of performance ability. It can include support for the development of human resources, organisational structures and processes, or institutional and legal frameworks.</p>
E	Exchanges	<p>Exchanges or other forms of mobility are one of the cornerstones of the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP); they allow different target groups to spend time in a different Member State for educational purposes, including university students (Erasmus), secondary school pupils and teachers (Comenius), professionals and participants in vocational education and training (Leonardo da Vinci), and staff in</p>

		<p>adult education (Grundtvig). Mobility also features in other programmes such as the Culture programme (for cultural operators) or the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs Preparatory Action.</p> <p>They have not been tested as part of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport.</p>
--	--	---

## **Instrument A: Transnational collaborative projects**

### *Effectiveness*

Support for transnational collaborative projects is meant to enable relevant actors (public bodies or civil society organisations) from several different MS to jointly work towards a pre-defined set of common objectives. Depending on the specific subject area, beneficiaries will include primarily sport associations / federations, other sport organisations (such as training academies or national Olympic committees) local authorities, universities and research institutions, ministries, and in some cases even sport-specific businesses. Typically, such projects aim to achieve some or all of the following:

Create sustainable transnational networks;

Compile, exchange and generate knowledge and information;

Identify, share and disseminate good practices in a particular field;

Raise awareness of common problems and challenges;

Jointly develop and/or implement innovative solutions to such challenges.

#### *1. Promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity*

A priori,<sup>41</sup> transnational collaborative projects have the potential to be effective to some extent when it comes to promoting good governance in sport. As noted in the Impact Assessment report, many sport organisations suffer from a lack of human and financial resources and of expertise. This in turn can mean that basic principles of good governance in sport can be neglected, and that sport organisations fail to achieve their educational and social goals, and are unable to contribute fully to a balanced and structured policy dialogue at the EU level. Networking and exchange of experience and good practices between sport organisations could partly address the problem of the lack of expertise, enable participating organisations to identify common challenges and jointly develop solutions, and learn from each other when it comes to organisational structure, approaches to good governance, ways to gain access to specific expertise, promote volunteering, etc.

#### *2. Promote health-enhancing physical activity and increased participation in sport*

---

<sup>41</sup> Transnational projects in the area of good governance will be tested through Preparatory Actions in 2011. The hypotheses in this section should be tested against the experience with these projects once results become available.

Transnational collaborative projects have the potential to be very effective with a view to supporting and promoting cross-sector innovative partnerships to foster learning across Europe's borders, and inform and encourage future actions that promote health enhancing physical activity. The main factors that have led to this assessment are:

**Benefits of action at the local level:** While national governments clearly have an important role to play, grassroots sport and physical activity is essentially a local phenomenon. The resources local actors have at their disposal tend to be limited, which means pooling of efforts, mutual learning and dissemination of best practices can empower many more local organisations to implement effective approaches to enhance participation in HEPA.

**Benefits of cross-sector partnerships:** Participation in sport and physical activity depends on many variables, including adequate infrastructure, appropriately qualified instructors, and attitudinal factors. Therefore, integrated approaches that involve and network actors from various sectors including sport organisations, educational institutions, local government, and businesses are ideal. The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport has confirmed that the most successful projects tended to have a cross-sectoral element.

**Benefits of cross-border co-operation and learning:** The level of physical activity of both adults and children varies significantly from one MS to another, as does the amount of experience and expertise of HEPA promotion. This means there is large potential for fruitful exchanges between actors from across the EU.

The high demand for transnational collaborative projects in the field of HEPA has already been confirmed by the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport. 134 project applications were submitted in response to the 2009 call for proposals; nine of these were selected for EU funding. In general terms, these projects have been evaluated positively in terms of their effectiveness and impacts; a survey among co-ordinators and partners suggests that transnational projects in the area of HEPA were particularly likely to have created new networks, and to have achieved the objectives defined at the outset.

### *3. Exploit the potential of sport to foster social inclusion and ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport*

Transnational collaborative projects are potentially very effective for enabling stakeholders to use the potential of sport to foster social inclusion. The reasons are broadly similar to those outlined for the field of HEPA above. Approaches vary significantly not only between Member States, but also between regions and local communities; therefore, cross-border co-operation and exchange of information has a high potential for stimulating innovative thinking and facilitating the extension of promising approaches. Cross-sectoral networking is also important, since understanding and tackling the different obstacles faced by disadvantaged groups and/or those at risk of social exclusion requires co-operation between sport organisations and other partners.

A recent conference organised with support from the Belgian EU Presidency confirmed the existence of numerous good practice examples for social inclusion in and through sport at the local level, and recommended for the EU to stimulate co-ordination and exchange of knowledge on all levels, including transnational projects on social inclusion and sport.<sup>42</sup> At its

---

<sup>42</sup> [http://www.isbvzw.be/uploads/53096131/downloads/europees\\_20congres\\_online\\_versie.pdf](http://www.isbvzw.be/uploads/53096131/downloads/europees_20congres_online_versie.pdf)

first meeting in 2010, the EU Working Group "Social Inclusion and Equal Opportunities in Sport" also confirmed that MS had different approaches to the subject, and expressed the view that they could learn from each others' good practices regarding how (and under which conditions) sport could contribute to social inclusion.<sup>43</sup>

In 2009 and 2010, the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport offered support for transnational projects in the areas of encouraging sport for people with disabilities, gender equality, and social inclusion. A total of 149 project applications were submitted, indicating a very high level of interest from sport organisations and others; ten were awarded EU co-funding.

The fight against violence at major sport events as such is primarily a security matter that needs to be tackled by the police and other security forces. Besides projects for police coordination, which have been supported by the Prevention and Fight against Crime Programme<sup>44</sup> and which should be best left within the remit of DG HOME, intolerance and discrimination (including racism and homophobia) that persists in sport and often motivates violent incidents can usefully be addressed through multi-stakeholder collaboration. A recent study by the FRA<sup>45</sup> that focused on racism and ethnic discrimination found inter alia that racist incidents in football occurred not only among fans in men's professional and amateur football, but also in children's and youth football. Racist incidents were also recorded in amateur football, not only among players but even referees and club officials. To tackle this problem, the FRA study identified a need for national and local authorities to work with sport organisations and for sports governing bodies to elaborate and implement effective anti-racism regulations and equality measures.

Given the different approaches and systems in use in different MS, there is a clear potential for relevant actors from across Europe to co-ordinate efforts, exchange good practices and jointly develop solutions, and for the EU to support their efforts through funding for transnational collaborative projects. In addition to the actors mentioned in the FRA recommendations above, there is also a role for educational institutions, supporters' organisations, and NGOs active in this field when it comes to promoting respect for fundamental European values in and through sport.

#### *4. Improve the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers*

Transnational collaborative projects are potentially quite effective to promote the concept of dual careers and more generally, address the balance between the education and training of young athletes. Networking and co-operation among various stakeholders at the EU level is likely to render significant benefits due to the fact that the problem affects young athletes across Europe (and in particular those who compete and/or train abroad), and that there are significant differences between Member States, sport associations and sport centres in terms

---

<sup>43</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc/b23/wg\\_sieo\\_080710\\_summary\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/doc/b23/wg_sieo_080710_summary_report.pdf)

<sup>44</sup> Pan European Football Policing Training (JLS/2008/ISEC/54 and JLS/2009/ISEC/FP/584), Security at major sport events (JLS/2009/ISEC/400), Gathering of all local forces to prevent violence in sporting events – GOAL (JLS/2008/ISEC/80)

<sup>45</sup> European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) Racism, ethnic discrimination and exclusion of migrants and minorities in sport: The situation in the European Union (2010). URL: [http://194.30.12.221/fraWebsite/attachments/Report-racism-sport-summary\\_EN.pdf](http://194.30.12.221/fraWebsite/attachments/Report-racism-sport-summary_EN.pdf)

of how the academic education of young athletes is regulated and facilitated, as well as in the level of support and career counselling available to athletes once their compulsory education is over.<sup>46</sup> This suggests there is considerable scope for mutual learning and exchange of experience and good practices. Furthermore, there are significant benefits to be reaped from cross-sectoral co-operation involving public authorities, sports organisations, educational institutions and businesses, all of which have a role to play in enhancing the employability and career prospects of athletes.

#### *5. Contribute to the fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport*

For similar reasons as those outlined under previous objectives, transnational collaborative projects have a strong potential to contribute to the fight against doping in amateur sport (including fitness). Networking between relevant actors (including sport organisations, research and health organisations, the fitness sector, anti-doping agencies, and the pharmaceutical industry) seems especially important given that doping in amateur sport is only recently beginning to be widely recognised as a problem, and as a consequence, there has so far been a dearth of actions and initiatives that specifically target doping in amateur sport and fitness, as well as a lack of precise information on the actual magnitude of the problem, factors underlying it and ways to combat it. Therefore, co-ordination, collaboration and exchange of information and good practices between actors from different MS can be very useful in identifying and promoting effective approaches.

This is also the view of the EU Working Group on Anti-Doping, which at its meeting in May 2010 heard national reports from those MS who seem to have been most active in this field so far (namely Belgium, Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands) and expressed its conviction that doping in amateur sport (and in particular prevention work in fitness studios) as a priority for future exchange as well as for funding under the future EU Sport Programme.

#### *EU added value*

Transnational projects, if well designed, have, by their very nature, an added value for the EU. The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport and experience gathered, for instance through projects financed within the European Year of Education through Sport 2004, confirms the strong interest of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders to cooperate across EU borders and to engage in network activities in order to learn and improve processes and activities of their organisation, which they could not do by only acting at national level. The EU added value could be clearly demonstrated in a number of ways, but, according to the evaluation, transnational projects maximise added value especially when a) facilitating cooperation and exchange of good practice between sport organisations in Europe so that discrepancies between Member States in different sport sectors can be addressed, b) project teams are comprised of partners which add value individually to the whole project and have significant networks and / or access to organisations with significant networks to facilitate wide dissemination of value generated, and c) projects are run by coordinators with proven project management experience enabling them to maximise the potential synergies that can be generated between the project partners. Experience with the transnational projects financed to date also shows that they have facilitated the spread of innovative methods and expertise.

---

<sup>46</sup> Study on training of young sportsmen/women in Europe, TAJ, 2008.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/sport/pdf/doc507\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/pdf/doc507_en.pdf)



## *Efficiency*

The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport concluded that the budget allocated to transnational projects in selected areas proved sufficient to test a limited number of network themes, types and sizes while employing a robust, but not overly restricted selection process, and especially considering the experimental nature of the Preparatory Actions. However, the report also noted that in order to reach a critical mass of impacts cost-effectively, a future programme should fund transnational projects in all relevant areas on an ongoing basis. The evaluation also concluded that efficiency gains could be achieved for future incentive measures through outsourcing administration to the competent agency. Concerning individual projects, the evaluation found that future incentive measures should encourage better networking methods *inter alia* through allocating financial responsibility to more than one organisation per project and requiring organisations to define roles for all project partners during the proposal stage. A simulation on the allocation of funds is provided in Annex III, which also illustrates that the majority of funding should be directed to the instrument of transnational projects.

## **Instrument B: Support for non-commercial European sport events of major importance**

### *Effectiveness*

Future incentive measures could provide budgetary support to the organisation of non-commercial sport events of major importance. Such support has formed nearly half of funding available under the Preparatory Actions 2009-2010<sup>47</sup> and has essentially consisted of direct budgetary contributions in order to achieve 'greater European visibility at sporting events'.<sup>48</sup> This objective does not fall under any of the specific objectives identified for future incentive measures, but an EU presence at such events could plausibly contribute to 'developing the European dimension in sport', as stipulated in Article 165 of the Lisbon Treaty.

EU subsidies to major sport events in 2009 and 2010 have generally ranged from EUR 1-3 million and, thus far, have achieved limited success in increasing the visibility of the EU. While hard evidence (media monitoring reports, website hits, television ratings, etc.) is lacking, it appears that events with an EU-wide focus, taking place outside the realm of mainstream spectator sport, and for which EU support is crucial either to the event as a whole or to specific activities taking place within it, have achieved the greatest level of visibility. These have consisted in particular of events aimed at youth or the disabled. Grander events tend to attract large audiences but media coverage typically centres only on competition results, while event organisers, less dependent on EU funding, are not compelled to ensure EU visibility.

However, it is also worth noting that, within the framework of the Preparatory Actions, funding for specific sport events has been mandated in each Annual Work Programme, precluding any attempts from the Commission to tailor the events to its own objectives. In future, an open tendering process could secure a role for the Commission in event organisation and ensure the selection of events aiming to secure a high degree of EU visibility; larger impacts in this regard could then be foreseen.

---

<sup>47</sup> 2009 and 2010 Annual Work Programmes.

<sup>48</sup> European Commission Annual Work Programme 2009.

Through such a tendering process, the Commission could also select events that would work towards the specific objectives identified for incentive measures. While none of the events supported thus far has explicitly pursued these or similar objectives, progress has nonetheless been achieved in a number of them. If the Commission required event organisers to emphasise these objectives, even greater progress could be expected.

*1. Promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity*

Non-commercial sport events can be effective to a limited extent with a view to promoting good governance, in that they rely heavily on volunteers and tend to encourage temporary voluntary activity leading up to, during and after competitions. According to organisers, volunteering for the events instils a sense of civic pride in those involved and increases the chances that they would participate in voluntary structures of sport in the long term.

*2. Promote health-enhancing physical activity and increased participation in sport*

Through boosting the popularity and public enthusiasm for sport among spectators and television viewers, it is plausible that major sport events increase audiences' participation in HEPA. However, given the flood of sport coverage currently available, it is unlikely that a small increase on the back of EU funding would lead to a dramatic rise in sport participation among the general public. Instead, support for specialised events targeting specific groups is likely to produce larger impacts. In addition, support for activities peripheral to the main sport competitions, often involving local populations, could also produce considerable impacts in this area. However, the scope of such activities must be considered limited given that they are geographically constrained to the region or (at best) the Member State where a given event takes place.

*3. Exploit the potential of sport to foster social inclusion and ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport*

For reasons similar to those outlined for HEPA above, support for sport events aimed specifically at disadvantaged groups could promote participation in sport and thereby generate significant impacts for social inclusion.

This is particularly evident for events aimed at people with disabilities, which can lead to positive impacts in several ways. Given that sport organisations and infrastructure aimed at people with disabilities are far less developed than those targeting mainstream sport, elite disabled athletes would be considerably less likely to participate in sport without the existence of impetus provided by these events. A 'trickle-down' effect could then be expected, with support for elite sportsmen and sportswomen encouraging other disabled athletes. Aside from providing disabled athletes with a sense of community and belonging, events focused on people with disabilities can demonstrate for carers, parents, relatives etc. the possibilities of sport participation for members of this group. Peripheral events, though limited to the Member State or region where events take place, would also be expected to make a considerable impact through fostering further participation in sport among the disabled and helping to encourage interaction between them and other social groups.

Major sport events have the potential to make common cause between athletes, coaches, volunteers and spectators from around Europe, promoting cooperation and instilling a sense of community and EU values, thereby contributing to a reduction of violence, racism and

intolerance. This can also be achieved through targeted awareness raising campaigns alongside those events.

*4. Improve the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers*

*5. Contribute to the fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport*

Support for sport events of major importance is unlikely to make a significant contribution to achieving these objectives.

### ***EU added value***

EU support for non-commercial sport events bears a great potential in terms of generating added value from an EU perspective. The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions confirmed that in particular Europe-focused special events involving young people and people with disabilities produce EU added-value and contribute to the European dimension in sport. The positive experience with the intervention areas of health-enhancing physical activity and education were especially highlighted in this respect. However, lessons have to be learned from the special events financed under the Preparatory Actions until now. The evaluation shows that the selection of special events would benefit from an open tendering procedure including transparent award criteria, so as to ensure that these events contribute to overall programme objectives. Moreover, in a future programme, plans for awareness raising of the European dimension in sport and EU sporting issues more generally should usefully be integrated within the main event financed, so as to enhance the EU added value.

### ***Efficiency***

The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport confirmed that, despite the lack of a competitive bidding process or objective selection criteria, specific types of events, notably those for youth and people with disabilities, and activities carried out therein were efficient. This is also true when analysing the relatively high unit costs for this instrument and the intended impact. The report also makes the case for a greater focus on specific activities peripheral to the event themselves in order to achieve substantial visibility. As illustrated in above section 6.2, EU support would remain inefficient with regard to the achievement of objectives if the financial contribution was too small. A simulation on the allocation of funds is provided in Annex III, which also illustrates that the second biggest amount of funding should be directed to the instrument of special events.

## **Instrument C: Support for strengthening the evidence base for policy making**

This instrument entails support for studies, comparative research, statistics, surveys, conferences and publications in order to contribute to building common EU knowledge about the sport sector, the opportunities and challenges it faces. Sport economics, for instance, is one area that is emerging as a new field for transnational cooperation in Europe, and under this instrument, ongoing work aimed at measuring the economic impact of sport could be supported.

*1. Promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity*

A solid evidence base is a precondition for effective governance. Studies and other forms of research are therefore necessary to provide policy makers at all levels with relevant data and information they need to develop effective policies. In this sense, they can effectively contribute to enhancing governance by helping the Commission and other stakeholders (including sport organisations) understand the exact scope and nature of the various sport-related problems, and develop appropriate responses to them. Although transnational collaborative projects (instrument A) can also play a role in this regard (insofar as they often incorporate elements that compile and generate knowledge and information, e.g. on different national approaches or good practices), they cannot substitute rigorous original research. The numerous references to EU-funded studies in this IA report may serve as evidence of their value.

*2. Promote health-enhancing physical activity and increased participation in sport*  
*3. Exploit the potential of sport to foster social inclusion and ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport*

*4. Improve the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers*

*5. Contribute to the fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport*

Studies, conferences etc. can also contribute to more effective policies in all of these areas by improving the evidence base – it is sufficient to refer back to the arguments made in the paragraph above.

### ***EU added value***

Better and comparable data, as well as more reliable information on sport would greatly benefit EU policy making in the field of sport. The need for a better evidence-base to take informed decisions has been repeatedly highlighted at EU level (White Paper on Sport, Communication on sport, EU Work Plan for Sport, EU Conference on Sport Statistics). The evaluation of the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport also confirmed that the financing of measures in this field (studies/surveys/conferences) fulfilled their role of providing the Commission and other actors with policy support to develop the European dimension in sport and recommended that the current approach to this instrument needed no change and should continue.

### ***Efficiency***

EU support for studies/surveys/conferences in selected priority areas is considered a cost-effective means to help increase understanding of the sector and drive the policy process forward with a view to developing the European dimension in sport. It is the instrument that has been evaluated to work perfectly well over the past years in terms of providing the required outputs for a given cost. However, in order to further enhance cost-effectiveness, the report suggests that the Commission could increasingly share the results with relevant stakeholders and with relevant services internally. A simulation on the allocation of funds is provided in Annex III, which also illustrates that a moderate amount of funding should be directed to the instrument of studies/surveys/conferences.

### **Instrument D: Support for capacity building in sport**

Capacity building is potentially any assistance provided to organisations to develop specific skills or competences, or for general upgrading of performance ability. Capacity building for sport organisations could take essentially two different forms:

**Operating grants:** Support to finance some of the core operating costs of organisations that undertake activities that are in line with the specific objectives. Operating grants are available through a number of current EU programmes.

**Targeted support:** Rather than provide financial support for individual organisations' core activities, the EU could support measures to target specific needs of groups of sport organisations. Longer term competences development programmes (including training, staff exchanges, or twinning schemes) seem especially relevant.

*1. Promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity*

Capacity building in the form of support for the development of human resources, organisational structures and processes has a high potential to contribute to promoting good governance in sport and enhancing the accountability, effectiveness and sustainability of sport structures.

Operating grants could be effective with a view to promoting good governance among European sport organisations. In the specific case of sport organisations, operating grants could be used to support European sport organisation whose mission is clearly valuable from a broader societal point of view. In fact, two such organisations received operating grants from the Europe for Citizens programme in 2008: the European Paralympic Committee and the European Non Governmental Sports Organisation (ENGSO). However, it is more difficult to see how operating grants to European organisations representing specific sport disciplines could be justified. For this reason, targeted support for specific processes or activities will be more effective with a view to building relevant capacities that promote good governance among European and national sport organisations and enable them to not only serve their members better, but also to participate more actively in the policy dialogue at EU level. This kind of support needs to be directed towards the development of specific skills, competences, structures or processes that have proven to be lacking, and whose enhancement would allow such organisations to better respect key principles of good governance. Where mutual learning is likely to generate significant benefits, the involvement of organisations from different sports should also be supported.

*2. Promote health-enhancing physical activity and increased participation in sport*  
*3. Exploit the potential of sport to foster social inclusion and ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport*  
*4. Improve the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers*

*5. Contribute to the fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport*

Capacity building would be largely irrelevant with a view to all of these objectives.

***EU added value***

Structures and processes in sport are very diverse and fragmented, given the very nature of sport and the high number of actors and organisations in the sector. Dialogue and cooperation with key sport stakeholders at EU level, in parallel to the political process, is key to developing the European dimension in sport and to addressing the challenges in the sector. A successful and inclusive EU level dialogue with sport stakeholders to a large extent depends on the capacity of relevant sport stakeholders to understand and actively participate in this process, but especially on the degree to which principles of good governance are respected within organisations. EU policy making would therefore greatly benefit from strengthened capacity of certain groups of sport(-related) organisations and their ability to follow good governance principles. The EU would finally also have an image gain when demonstrating its readiness to help support the quality of processes and activities within the sector. The EU added value of this instrument must therefore be expected to be high.

### ***Efficiency***

Financial support for capacity building in the field of sport must be considered highly efficient if it is well-targeted. The costs for support targeted to the needs of specific groups of organisations can be expected to largely outweigh the gains in terms of improving good governance within sport organisations and of strengthening their capacity to understand and participate in EU level dialogue. A simulation on the allocation of funds is provided in Annex III, which also illustrates that a moderate amount of funding should be directed to the instrument of capacity building.

### **Instrument E: Support for exchanges of athletes / volunteers / sport professionals**

Exchanges or other forms of mobility are one of the cornerstones of the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP); they allow different target groups to spend time in a different Member State for educational purposes, including university students (Erasmus), secondary school pupils and teachers (Comenius), professionals and participants in vocational education and training (Leonardo da Vinci), and staff in adult education (Grundtvig). Mobility also features in other programmes such as the Culture programme (for cultural operators) or the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs Preparatory Action.

In the context of incentive measures in the field of sport, exchanges could be envisaged for the following target groups who are currently not eligible to receive support for exchanges through any of the existing EU instruments:

Staff of sport organisations

Sport coaches or instructors

Young athletes

There are different ways in which exchanges could be supported from a financial and administrative point of view, including through individual grants to those spending time abroad, or through direct support for selected host organisations. If exchanges are to be supported, the pros and cons of different instrument will have to be carefully weighed before a selection is made.

*1. Promote good governance in sport in the EU and sustain sport structures based on voluntary activity*

In view of the constraints under which many sport organisations operate, in particular their reliance on volunteers, exchanges of staff of sport organisations can be effective to strengthen the capacity of such organisations and thereby promote good governance.

During his or her stay abroad, the visitor will be expected to contribute his or her own knowledge and experience to the host organisation. More importantly, he or she should acquire specific knowledge or skills that will help him or her to better ensure respect for principles of good governance within his or her own organisation, and/or a more active participation in the sport policy dialogue, after his or her return. In addition, such exchanges often create lasting personal bonds and thereby help to strengthen the working relationship between the two organisations, and can thus also contribute to the development of the European dimension in sport.

Learning effects are likely to occur mainly due to the vastly different levels of resources and professionalism of different organisations. Some very popular sports (such as football) generate more interest and resources than others, and therefore tend to be run by more well endowed organisations more or less everywhere in Europe. However, there are also sports that are more popular in some parts of Europe than in others, with important consequences for how relevant governing bodies and other organisations function. Thus, learning effects can be expected from exchanges between a variety of organisations. Ideally, this type of exchanges should be based on a benchmarking or similar exercise. Such exercises could form part of capacity building activities (see instrument E below).

#### *4. Improve the education and training of sportspeople, in particular through the promotion of dual careers*

In pursuit of the objective of improving the education and training of sportspeople, exchanges of coaches or instructors could be effective with a view to enhancing their awareness of the need to balance sport and study, and of effective approaches to do so. This could be achieved by enabling coaches or instructors from elite sport institutions or academies to spend time at an institution in another MS that is recognised as representing good practice when it comes to enabling athletes to combine training with education. The project “Athletes to Business” identified several such examples, such as the so called “Eliteschulen des Sports” in Germany or participating institutions in the “Olympic Career Path” programme in Hungary.<sup>49</sup> In any case, the implementation of good practices with a view to dual careers depends to a great extent on mobilising a variety of different actors, so exchanges of coaches and instructors should only be seen as a measure complementing transnational collaborative projects (see instrument A above).

In a similar vein, exchanges of young athletes could also be envisaged. Highly talented sportspeople often need training experience abroad to compete on the highest level in adulthood, in particular for specific sports. The EU could contribute to making such periods abroad compatible with a high quality education by supporting stays at high performance sport centres or academies that meet strict criteria with a view to the promotion of dual careers (e.g. because they form part of a specific national scheme or have signed up to a dual career charter). At present, access by athletes from another MS to such institutions is often prevented by the fact that they are subsidised by the relevant national authorities, who have no

---

<sup>49</sup> A2B Guidelines “Promoting Dual Careers in the EU”, March 2011. URL: [http://www.athletestobusiness.eu/docs/budapest/A2B\\_guidelines\\_final.pdf](http://www.athletestobusiness.eu/docs/budapest/A2B_guidelines_final.pdf)

incentive to accommodate athletes who will eventually compete for other national teams. However, initial contacts with such relevant actors suggest that they would be willing to cooperate if they could be (partly) compensated for hosting foreign athletes. A positive effect on employability could be generated in the case of young athletes who would have to move abroad for a period of time, and who thanks to EU support for such exchanges would have the opportunity to train and study at a foreign institution that prioritises dual career.

*2. Promote health-enhancing physical activity and increased participation in sport*

*3. Exploit the potential of sport to foster social inclusion and ensure equal opportunities for all and reduce the incidence of violence, racism and other forms of intolerance in sport*

*5. Contribute to the fight against doping in amateur and grassroots sport*

Exchanges are unlikely to be effective with a view to any of these objectives.

### ***EU added value***

Exchanges and other forms of mobility in the field of sport may have added value at EU level insofar as they could contribute to reinforcing transnational links and generating knowledge and expertise by sharing good practices especially with regard to the attainment of objective 4. However, it seems that the same results may more usefully be achieved through collaborative projects examined as instrument A.

### ***Efficiency***

The management of individual grants for mobility would need the set-up of appropriate management structures, notably National Agencies in charge of administering a great number of micro-grants. In this respect, instrument E would be far more costly to manage than instrument A whereby the two instruments are likely to achieve the same results in particular with regard to objective 4.

On the basis of the considerations presented above, instrument E is discarded and consequently not integrated as one of the implementing instruments of the proposed incentive measures in the field of sport.



### **ANNEX III : Indicative allocations**

The following table shows the indicative annual allocation of funds for future incentive measures in the field of sport, on the basis of a hypothetical annual budget of EUR 30 million under option 2.

#### **Indicative annual allocation of funds per instrument and intervention area**

Area of intervention	Instruments				Total per intervention area
	A Transnat'l projects	B Support for European sport events	C Studies, surveys, conferences	D Targeted capacity building	
Good governance	€2m		€2m	€3m	€7m
HEPA	€5m	€3m			€8m
Social inclusion and fight against intolerance	€3m	€7m			€10m
Education and training	€3m				€3m
Doping in amateur sport	€2m				€2m
<b>Total per year</b>	<b>€15m</b>	<b>€10m</b>	<b>€2m</b>	<b>€3m</b>	<b>€30m</b>

With an annual budget of EUR 30 million that is distributed among the instruments and areas of intervention as outlined above, an EU Sport programme covering seven years (2014-2020) could be expected to produce approximately the following number of outputs, at a total cost to the EU budget of EUR 210 million:

Around 200 transnational collaborative projects lasting two years each;

Support for 20-25 non-commercial European sport events of major importance;

Approximately 100 actions to strengthen the evidence base for policy making, such as studies, conferences, seminars, etc.;

Targeted capacity building for sport organisations worth up to EUR 21 million.

It should be underlined that although the theoretical possibility exists that the proposed EU incentive measures may lead to a crowding out of incentive building in Member States or to reduced funding of existing programmes implemented by international sporting organisations, this is unlikely to happen in practice. The analysis of the effectiveness of the instruments for

the proposed measures clearly shows that the actions that are envisaged are currently not implemented either at national level or by international sport organisations.

Any crowding out that may be provoked by co-funding requirements which will be established when managing the proposed incentive measures is also highly unlikely since it would be implausible for a Member State to discontinue funding its own national sport projects in view of possible funding streams for international cooperation projects originating from the EU.

## **ANNEX IV: Executive Summary of the Report on the Evaluation of the Preparatory Actions and Special Events in the field of sport**

### ***(1) Preparatory Actions and special events in the field of sport***

Sport in the European Union context has been developing since the late 1990s. The 2000 Nice Declaration recognised the integral role of sport in European society, while through the 2004 European Year of Education through Sport the Commission co-financed about 200 sport-related projects. However, it was not until the 2007 White Paper on Sport that the EU addressed sport-related issues in a comprehensive manner. The White Paper identified three dimensions of sport (social, economic and organisational) that should be taken into account when developing the EU's approach and in the accompanying Action Plan "Pierre de Coubertin" suggested a number of actions to be implemented at EU level. The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty (TFEU) in December 2009 marked another milestone, conferring a direct competence to the EU in the area of sport. Article 165 stipulates that: "The Union shall contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues, while taking account of the specific nature of sport, its structures are based on voluntary activity and its social and education function".

Following from this, a budget line was granted for three years of Preparatory Actions (from 2009-2011) in the field of sport and special annual events, with the general objective of preparing for future EU actions in the field of sport in view of the implementation of the sport provisions of the Lisbon Treaty. The total budget for the 2009-2011 period amounts to about EUR 25.5m, with activities consisting of:

Transnational collaborative projects, EUR 8.5m, about 40 projects, consisting of co-financing support to enable relevant actors (e.g. sport associations / federations, other sport organisations, local authorities, universities and research institutions, ministries, sport-specific businesses) to work towards EU objectives by creating sustainable networks; compiling, exchanging and generating knowledge and information; identifying, sharing and disseminating good practices; raising awareness of problems and challenges; and jointly developing / implementing solutions to such challenges;

Non-commercial sport events of major importance, five projects, EUR 8.5m, consisting of budgetary contributions to two European Youth Olympic Festivals (Tampere 2009 and Liberec 2010), two Special Olympics Summer Games (Warsaw 2010 and Athens 2011) and the Mediterranean Games (Pescara 2009);

Studies, surveys and conferences, 18 projects, EUR 2.1m, consisting of support to contribute to building common EU knowledge about the sport sector, the opportunities and challenges that it faces.

### ***(2) The evaluation***

The main task of the evaluation was to analyse and assess the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as the EU-added value, of the Preparatory Actions and special events that

were carried out during 2009 and 2010, the first two years of Preparatory Action funding.<sup>50</sup> The evaluation collected data and information through a mix of primary and secondary sources, with a heavy emphasis on the former. The main data collection methods were:

A survey of coordinators and partners for the transnational projects funded in 2009;

A survey of coordinators for the transnational projects funded in 2010;

Case studies of seven 2009 transnational projects, one conference and three non-commercial sport events. The case studies included interviews with the project coordinators / event organisers and partners, and detailed analyses of available outputs, reporting and other documentation;

Desk research, including analyses of relevant policy documents, programme information and budgetary data.

### **(3) Summary of key findings**

#### **(a) Relevance**

##### Transnational projects

The objectives and Annual Work Programmes of the Preparatory Actions were relevant and consistent with the sport provisions of the Lisbon Treaty and other EU policies, ranging from overarching policies such as the Europe 2020 Strategy to subject-specific documents such as the Together for Health White Paper.

##### Non-commercial sport events

While the support of a number of special events could be considered to be clearly linked to the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, the design of the Commission's support limited what the events were able to achieve. Lack of a competitive and selective tendering process, with well articulated objectives and links to the Commission's policy agenda, meant that it was difficult to measure whether any tangible contribution had been made to high level policy objectives.

##### Studies, surveys and conferences

The studies, conferences, seminars were used to facilitate new information and exchanges of good practice and contacts between key organisations in sport across a number of high priority areas. These were relevant to developing the EU dimension in sport and, more generally, can also be linked to policies such as the Europe 2020 Strategy.

#### **(b) EU added value**

---

<sup>50</sup> Due to the timing of the evaluation, the 2011 activities are not taken into account here. Moreover, the majority of data collected refers to projects funded in 2009, which were complete in time for the data collection phase of the evaluation.

### Transnational projects

EU added value was demonstrated in a number of ways, including:

Alleviating discrepancies between Member States;

Spreading best practices;

Testing the viability of networks across the subject areas supported;

Providing policy support through knowledge generation;

Strengthening the European dimension in sport.

Importantly, none of the projects could have been carried out successfully by organisations acting at national level, since they addressed issues with a cross-border element and / or challenges for which no one Member State had identified a complete solution. The transnational projects have facilitated the spread of innovative methods and expertise.

At the project level, the EU added value varied according to such factors as maturity of the sector in question, the composition of individual networks and the types of organisations involved, the limited duration of support (i.e. one year) and the management procedures of projects. It is also clear that, while support for long-existing networks may be more effective in the short term, promoting the establishment and expansion of networks also demonstrates European added value. Support for transnational projects found a good balance between these two possibilities for adding value.

### Non-commercial sport events

The EU-added value of support for special events did not realise its full potential and could have been significantly increased had the Commission been given the opportunity to set specific award criteria against which applicants could have been scored and held accountable.

### Studies, surveys and conferences

Studies, surveys, conferences and seminars fulfilled their role of providing the Commission and other actors with policy support and developing the EU dimension in sport. They also contributed to the establishment of the Commission as an important contributor to the development of EU sport.

## *(c) Effectiveness*

### Transnational projects

At a general level, it was difficult to translate project outcomes into tangible lessons for policy makers, given the short timeframe of the projects and their experimental nature. However, the projects achieved considerable success in promoting sport issues and developing the European dimension in sport, in particular with regard to building and strengthening networks between

partner organisations in different sectors, and kick-starting cooperation between organisations working on sport around Europe.

Individual projects demonstrated considerable success in achieving their own objectives. The identification and publication of printed materials were achieved to a great extent. Developing and strengthening knowledge between project partners was a key achievement, while progress in networking at a truly European level proved more difficult, unless EU umbrella-type organisations were included in the network of partners.

More specifically, networks fostering multi-lateral collaboration between partners, rather than bilateral contact between individual partners and the coordinating organisation, appear to have been the most sustainable and successful. Key factors which positively or negatively affected what the transnational projects could achieve included the size and make-up of the network (for example, projects required partnerships involving organisations with experience relevant to reaching project goals). Additionally, it was difficult for projects to claim EU-level relevance, for example when mapping activities were carried out in a limited sample of countries. Well managed projects achieved more, using resources more efficiently and drawing out the potential synergies of partners.

#### Non-commercial sport events

Aside from the Mediterranean Games, the other two special events investigated (EYOWF and European Special Olympic Summer Games) contributed to supporting the development of the European dimension in sport. These events seemed to take into account policy areas expressed in the White Paper to develop a range of side activities to support EU ideals. All events also met their specific objectives. However, the lack of specific award criteria made it difficult for the Commission to ensure that these objectives fit with the rest of objectives of the Preparatory Actions.

#### Studies, surveys and conferences

These activities were useful tools for the promotion of EU sporting issues and the provision of information to the Commission and the broader EU sport community. The information is likely to be used to contribute to better policy making in the subject areas covered in addition to strengthening the European dimension in sport. Additionally, the evidence indicates that the individual activities funded were carried out successfully and achieved the objectives set for them.

#### *(d) Efficiency*

##### Transnational projects

The selection procedure for the transnational projects appears adequate and robust. While the calls for proposals were sufficiently flexible and widely publicised to stimulate the formation of new networks, existing networks were also encouraged to expand or broaden in scope. However, it is evident that organisations which had not previously been awarded funding had trouble breaking through.

On the programme level, the structure set up to administer the networking projects has been efficient. However, a larger, sustainable programme would likely be more efficiently managed by an Executive Agency, leaving policy officers the chance to more strategic matters. While the Executive Agency would be expected to take charge of most administrative matters, DG EAC's policy experts could retain an advisory role for project coordinators and partners.

The budget allocated to the Preparatory Actions proved sufficient to test a limited number of network themes, types and sizes while employing a robust, but not overly restrictive selection process.

#### Non-commercial sport events

The budget allowed the Commission to test several types of support for non-commercial sport events of major importance. Despite the lack of a competitive bidding process or objective selection criteria, specific types of events (i.e. those aimed at youth and people with disabilities) and activities carried out therein (e.g. peripheral activities aimed at the local population) demonstrated their effectiveness. This can be taken into account during the planning of future incentive measures.

#### **(4) Conclusions and recommendations**

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the following conclusions and recommendations are made to address shortcomings and make improvements for future incentive measures in the field of sport. They are centred on responses to a set of questions posed in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.

##### **(1) How can the incentive measures supporting the policy cooperation mechanisms be improved?**

Based on the evidence sourced during the evaluation, the measures could be improved in the following ways, by:

#### Transnational projects

- Capturing the lessons that have been learned by EC staff and project coordinators from the testing phase (2009-2011) in a structured way to ensure that the full benefit of the Preparatory Actions is taken into account in the development of the future programme.
- Increasing the duration of projects (in line with similar projects supported through other Commission programmes) to allow for more ambitious objectives and activities, while reducing administrative burden and improving the cost-effectiveness.
- Ensuring that the programme objectives and award criteria set for future incentive measures are in line with the size and scope of the individual projects to be funded, and the programme as a whole.

- Placing greater emphasis on the make-up of networks, plans for project management, and the expected contribution that each partner will make to project activities and objectives.
- Placing greater emphasis on the ultimate use of best practice collections, guidelines and the like. Projects must achieve clear EU added value and where possible spread and support the embedding of good practice to address discrepancies between different organisations and Member States.
- Ensuring that activities organised to promote sport among the general public address programme objectives, demonstrate a clear EU added value and / or contribute to the development of the European dimension in sport.

#### **Recommendations**

- It is recommended that a workshop is held after the Preparatory Actions are completed to facilitate a structured approach to capturing lessons learned. The Commission should host and chair the workshop and invite all project coordinators.
- It is recommended that projects of up to three years should be supported in the future. Programme objectives and award criteria should be adjusted to reflect this increased length, and the fact that the experimental, preparatory phase for incentive measures has come to an end. In particular, project proposals should include:
  - Need / expected added value to the sector in question;
  - Strength and relevance of the network and access to additional (e.g. pan-European) networks;
  - Plans for project management, including the specific roles for each partner in the design and implementation of activities and the potential for synergies between participating organisations;
  - Plans for dissemination of best practice collections, guidelines etc. including target beneficiaries and expected outcomes;
  - SMART objectives, including clear explanations stating how progress will be recorded.
- It is recommended that an emphasis on EU added value relates to all aspects of the projects, including activities aimed at the general public at local level. These should be based on identified good practice to ensure that maximum synergies between network partners are exploited and that the network and EU brands are given adequate weight.

#### Studies, surveys, conferences and seminars

- It is concluded that the current approach does not need to be modified.

#### **Recommendation**



- It is recommended that the current approach to studies, surveys, conferences and seminars is continued.

### Special events

- Using a competitive process, involving the use of transparent award criteria to select the special events that will receive EU support, would help to ensure that the events contribute to overall programme objectives.
- Support for Europe-focused special events involving young people and the disabled has been shown to produce EU added-value and contribute to the European dimension in sport. It is also broadly consistent with wider EU policies.
- Relying on traditional PR activities, such as press releases, is not highly effective at communicating the EU dimension in sport. The press tends to focus on the content of the event (for example competition results) rather than EU messages, while the presence of the EU logo is limited in what it can convey. However, the development of specific activities peripheral to the main sport competitions can be effective at making progress towards programme objectives. These activities include inter alia programmes for local schools and seminars taking place in parallel to the main event.
- The special events supported by the EU were not required to address a number of the priorities expressed in the 2007 White Paper, for example the use of the Eco Scheme, cross border volunteers and the development of good practice in the management of large events.
- It has been difficult to assess the outcomes of EU funding for special events. This stems from both a lack of specific requirements for event organisers and a lack of evidence of tangible outcomes.

### **Recommendations**

- It is recommended that the selection of special events is made via an open tendering process with transparent award criteria. Inter alia, events should comprise:
  - A non-commercial European sport event involving young people and / or the disabled (events that mainstream disabled competitions are to be encouraged);
  - Activities peripheral to the main sport competition that contribute directly to programme objectives;
  - Plans for awareness raising of the European dimension in sport / EU sporting issues, integrated within the main event;
  - The use of cross-border volunteers;
  - Use of the Eco Scheme.
- A set of requirements for event outcomes should be defined, including:

- Justification that financial support led to EU added value;
- Tangible evidence demonstrating that objectives have been met;
- A report highlighting lessons learned and good practice in the organisation of special events involving cross border volunteers.

**(2) How can the synergies and interaction between the different kinds of stakeholders be improved?**

- Encouraging the involvement of partners representing different types of organisations, where this adds value to project goals, could be made explicit in relevant EC documentation (e.g. Annual Work Programmes, Calls for Proposals). Feedback from partners in the 2009 projects suggests that complementary expertise provides fresh insight and adds value to project outcomes.
- Defining good practice / lessons learned in project management based on experiences from the Preparatory Actions could also help to achieve this goal. Examples from the 2009 Preparatory Actions include:
  - Partner selection processes to strengthen the make-up of networks;
  - Clearly defined practices for effective communication between network partners;
  - Project management methods that draw on the inputs of all partners and facilitate cross partner information exchange (rather than bilateral exchanges between coordinators and individual partners only).

**Recommendations**

- It is recommended that future Calls for Proposals are amended to reflect the experiences of the Preparatory Actions. Without increasing the administrative burden, during the selection process networks could be privileged that demonstrate:
  - A set of partners representing a diversity of organisation types;
  - A well reasoned rationale for selected networking partners;
  - Project management methods assigning responsibility evenly across partners according to expertise.
- It is recommended that DG EAC consider assigning financial responsibility for networking projects to more than one organisation per project.

**(3) How can the management system of the incentive measures be organised in order to be more effective and efficient?**

The Preparatory Actions and special events have been administered wholly by DG EAC staff. This ranged from purely administrative tasks (e.g. making financial transfers) to the evaluation of project proposals, and the provision of ad hoc advice to project coordinators and partners. The evaluation assessed this system as sufficiently efficient, especially in light of the experimental nature of the Preparatory Actions and the commensurate need to monitor projects closely (particularly given the proportion of networks and organisations receiving EU funding for the first time). However, the evaluation also revealed some room for improvement. Notably, formal reporting requirements, while considered onerous by project coordinators, would have been better tolerated if timely and constructive feedback had been provided.

While efficiency savings for future incentive measures will likely be achieved through outsourcing administration to the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, fully handing over responsibility for a future programme will subtract from the informal, advisory role currently played by DG EAC officials vis-à-vis project coordinators and partners. Instead, the Commission could continue to fulfil this function through encouraging contact between its own policy experts and staff of the organisations responsible for implementing transnational projects. In addition, DG EAC officials could work with the Executive Agency in order to ensure that formal reporting adds value to the projects, rather than being seen merely as a box-ticking exercise. This would achieve the sought after cost savings while involving DG EAC staff in the areas where they can add the most value.

At the level of individual projects, the evaluation found that networks functioned best when work was apportioned equally among those involved, whereas in ‘hub and spoke’ networks not all partners contributed fully. While some networks achieved the right balance during the Preparatory Actions, in future the Commission could encourage better working methods inter alia through allocating financial responsibility to more than one organisation per project and requiring organisations to define roles for all project partners during the proposal stage.

**Recommendations**

- It is recommended that the Commission outsource administration of future incentive measures to the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. However, DG EAC officials should continue to provide project coordinators with informal and ad hoc advice in their areas of expertise. This would lead to efficiency gains, as Executive Agency staff are accustomed to and have systems set up for administering large-scale funding programmes, while DG EAC would be able to channel its own limited human resources into the provision of policy expertise.
- Calls for Proposals should be designed as to encourage project coordinators and partners to share project ownership equally among coordinators and partners. In particular, this could include assigning financial responsibility to more than one organisation per project and a requirement to describe during the proposal process how each partner will be involved in the development and implementation of activities.

**(4) Which are the most effective and useful activities and what should be their relative weighting, considering the needs in the field of sport and the policy objectives? What should be the level of funding devoted to incentive measures in order to reach a critical mass of impacts cost-effectively?**

This evaluation has determined that an appropriate level of funding has been devoted to testing transnational projects, major sport events and studies, surveys and conferences. While the limited budget for Preparatory Actions was only able to test networks in several subjects per year, in order to achieve a critical mass of impacts cost effectively, a future programme should fund transnational projects in all relevant areas on an ongoing basis.

Taking into consideration the EUR 8.5m budget for networking projects over the three years of Preparatory Actions, the magnitude of problems in each subject area, interest and absorption capacity of relevant organisations, an annual allocation of about EUR 15m for transnational projects should be envisaged.

In light of the perceived effectiveness of support for major sport events, and the recommendations made in this evaluation for a greater focus on specific activities peripheral to the events themselves, an annual budget similar to the one available during 2009-2011 could be continued in future, with a small increase to allow for funding of more specific activities at the sport events (where the Commission can potentially achieve the greatest impact). This would amount to about EUR 4m annually and would be dedicated to events with a focus on youth and / or people with disabilities, where the Commission can realistically achieve substantial visibility.

The annual allocation of about EUR 0.65 for studies, surveys and conferences could be increased to EUR 1m. This would allow future incentive measures to consider the wider spectrum of activities to be covered. In addition, following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, this would provide policy support measures linked to increased cooperation at EU level in the field of sport.

Therefore, in total, an annual budget of at least EUR 20m could be envisaged in line with the table below.

	Instruments			Total per year
	Transnat'l collaborative projects	Support for European sport events	Studies, surveys, conferences	
	€15m	€4m	€1m	€20m

**Recommendations**

- It is recommended that the majority of funding for future incentive measures be

dedicated to transnational networking projects, as these have shown the greatest potential for achieving EU added value across the range of priorities reflected in EU sport policy. Substantial amounts should also be allocated to support for European sport events, which have in particular been proven effective in the fields of health-enhancing physical activity and social inclusion, while a small proportion of future funding for incentive measures could be usefully employed for studies, surveys and conferences which also add value.

- It is recommended that an annual budget of about EUR 20m is allocated as a minimum for achieving a critical mass of impacts cost effectively. This takes into account the magnitude of problems in specific subject areas, the absorption capacity of networks and the types of outcomes achieved during the years of Preparatory Action funding as well as the costs of administering incentive measures. However, it is also worth noting that a higher budget would increase the impact of future incentive measures in the field of sport. Roughly three fourths of this annual budget should be dedicated to transnational networks, while one fifth could be used to support sport events and the rest to sponsor / commission studies, surveys and conferences on topics of particular importance.

#### **(5) What are the actions / areas where the EU can provide most added-value?**

It is not possible to make comparisons between the effectiveness of the different types of interventions because of their different operating formats. Therefore, each intervention type is addressed separately.

##### **Transnational projects maximise added value when:**

- Projects facilitate cooperation and exchanges of good practice between sport organisations in Europe so that discrepancies between Member States in different sport sectors can be addressed;
- Project teams are comprised of partners which add value individually to the whole project and have significant networks and / or access to organisations with significant networks to facilitate wide dissemination of value generated;
- Projects are run by coordinators with proven project management experience who have a plan to maximise the potential synergies that can be generated between the partners in their project.

##### **Studies and surveys maximise added value when:**

- They meet a need for data recognised by the specific sport sector, generate robust data to increase understanding of that sector, and provide information that is shared among all stakeholders.

#### **Recommendations**

- It is recommended that the Commission ensure that sport stakeholders are consulted on the potential topics to be addressed by studies and surveys.
- It is recommended that the Commission make efforts to share the results of studies and surveys with relevant stakeholders both inside and outside the Commission.

**Conferences and seminars maximise added value when:**

- They bring principal sport stakeholders within a sector together to discuss a specific topic that is not facilitated by another forum.

**Recommendations**

- It is recommended that the Commission continue to support conferences and seminars.
- It is recommended that the practice of involving key external stakeholders in the design and implementation of events be continued to ensure maximum relevance and applicability to participants.
- It is recommended that the objectives and desired outputs of events should be clearly identified and, where possible, events should initiate follow up activities beneficial to the sport sector.

**Special events maximise EU added value when:**

- They support European sporting events which facilitate competitive sport among young people and the disabled. These events provide additional value when they also facilitate specific activities to promote the societal benefits of sport to other stakeholders, in particular for social inclusion and youth, in addition to building a European presence at major sport events.

**Recommendations**

- It is recommended that the Commission support European special events involving young people and the disabled.
- It is recommended that the Commission split funding between support to the operating costs of the event and the financing of specific activities, which contribute specifically to programme objectives.

## **ANNEX V: Executive summary of the Impact Assessment accompanying the Communication from the Commission "Developing the European Dimension in Sport"**

This impact assessment accompanies the Commission's Communication on "Developing the European Dimension in Sport". A summary of the main aspects of the impact assessment is presented hereafter.

### **Background**

Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) gives the EU a new competence to support, coordinate or supplement the actions of the Member States in the field of sport. The Treaty calls on the EU to contribute to the promotion of sporting issues and provides for EU action aimed at developing the European dimension in sport.

Article 165 TFEU also contains a reference to "incentive measures in the field of sport", based on which the Commission could have considered proposing a new spending scheme within the ongoing Financial Perspectives, for instance a limited 2-year EU sport programme. While there is awareness within the Commission of the high expectations from sport stakeholders regarding financial support from the EU in line with the Treaty mandate, an analysis of the current situation has led to the conclusion that there are important budgetary and substantive constraints pleading against such a proposal at this stage. Firstly, the remaining margin within the relevant chapter of the EU budget is very limited. Thus, a financial volume which could have allowed a first EU Sport Programme that would have had the potential of meeting its objectives could not be proposed. Secondly, the ongoing 2009 and 2010 Preparatory Actions in the field of sport have not yet been subject to an independent evaluation to justify the EU added value of a programme. An Impact Assessment for a future EU Sport Programme (as of 2014), drawing on the evaluation of the relevant Preparatory Actions in the field of sport, can only be completed in 2011. These considerations have led DG Education and Culture to reconsider its initial plan for a 2010 initiative combining a policy proposal with a spending programme.

This impact assessment is therefore carried out solely for a policy initiative (Communication) to implement the Lisbon Treaty in the field of sport. It builds on the new Treaty provisions and on a wealth of information gathered in the informal EU cooperation on sport over the past years, in particular the experience gained with the implementation of the 2007 White Paper on Sport and through a broad consultation process carried out in 2010.

### **Problem definition**

As a first step, the impact assessment addresses the need for EU action by identifying the main general and specific problems facing sport at EU level. Evidence suggests that there is scope for furthering the positive values and effects of sport, that there are threats jeopardising the sector's potential to contribute to society and to the economy, and that the development of the sport sector faces particular challenges.

However, no strategy has existed so far for an EU approach to sport that would engage the Commission and the Member States on the basis of a common agenda and that would be able to address the challenges in a comprehensive manner. The full potential of the sport sector to contribute to the EU's strategic objectives in the social and economic fields has so far remained unexploited.

The identification of the specific problems and challenges was conducted keeping in mind the Treaty's mandate and the necessity to exclusively address problems that are relevant at EU level (subsidiarity). They have been identified as follows:

- Challenges connected with sport's health-enhancing, social and educational functions:
  - Health concerns due to lack of physical activity;
  - Social exclusion of disadvantaged groups and unused potential of sport;
  - Unadapted systems to combine sport and education;
- Challenges for sustainable sport structures:
  - Insufficient support for voluntary activity;
  - Current and future challenges to the sustainable funding of sport, also in light of the regulatory changes in Member States in the gambling sector;
  - Inadequate protection of intellectual property rights;
- Doping as a threat to the physical and moral integrity of sportspeople;
- Discrimination in sport on grounds of nationality;
- Unused scope for improving EU-level dialogue on sport;
- Perceived lack of legal clarity regarding the application of EU law to sport;
- Insufficient information on sport for the EU-27.

## **Objectives**

In a second step, the impact assessment identifies the objectives of the planned initiative. Overall, the planned initiative should aim at making a contribution to the EU's overarching objectives laid down in the Europe 2020 strategy in terms of sustainable growth, fighting unemployment, reinforcing social inclusion and advancing people's Europe.

In *strategic* terms, the planned initiative should aim at providing the Commission and the Member States with a framework for EU-level activities in the field of sport that should foresee actions to be carried out on the basis of Article 165 TFEU.

In line with the specific challenges identified, the impact assessment elaborates on the *specific objectives* that the planned initiative should aim to achieve:

- Promote the health-enhancing, social and educational functions of sport;
- Support sport structures based on voluntary activity;
- Protect the physical and moral integrity of sportspeople;
- Promote fairness and openness in sporting competitions;



- Enhance dialogue and cooperation with sport stakeholders;
- Increase understanding of the application of EU law to sport;
- Support an evidence base for sport in the EU-27.

Under this chapter, the impact assessment furthermore analyses whether EU action is justified on grounds of subsidiarity and it describes the EU added value of the planned initiative.

In line with the Treaty mandate and since Member States have full competence in the field of sport, the EU initiative will not substitute the actions of the Member States but propose additional action in full respect of subsidiarity requirements and in areas where experience has demonstrated that progress in addressing the challenges identified cannot be sufficiently achieved by Member States in the framework of their national constitutional systems. The planned initiative will not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the defined objectives, but take account of proportionality requirements and the Treaty mandate, which excludes harmonisation and only provides for soft tools for EU-level action. The planned EU initiative will be implemented on the basis of existing national and European structures.

Regarding the rationale for European added value, the EU will act as a catalyst in order to increase the impact of national actions in the interest of sport. The EU-level initiative will allow for the development of activities that establish links between different organisations and actors in and outside sport, including in particular public authorities at European, national, regional and local levels, sport organisations, sport-related organisations, and educational bodies. The actions will lead to the exchange of know-how and good practices in different areas relating to sport and physical activity (e.g. health, education, social inclusion). The EU can thereby provide opportunities for cooperation among stakeholders that would not have existed without EU action.

### **Policy options**

In a third step, the impact assessment identifies three policy options that represent possible toolsets to meet the objectives identified:

- Option A: Cooperation based on the 2007 White Paper on Sport (baseline scenario);
- Option B: Definition of a strategic medium-term framework for cooperation in sport, based on a new EU Agenda for sport (framework + new agenda);
- Option C: Definition of a strategic long-term policy framework, based on the creation of an Open Method of Coordination in the field of sport (long-term framework + OMC).

### **Assessment of impacts**

In the next chapter, each of the three policy options is assessed in relation to

1. expected economic, social and environmental impacts, including an assessment of most important impacts in terms of likelihood and magnitude;
2. efficiency, which considers the relationship between inputs and the desired impacts and it also assesses the Commission's ability to deliver;

3. effectiveness, which considers the likelihood of achieving the objectives the initiative tends to achieve;
4. coherence in relation to overarching goals of EU policy.

a) Common to all options are the positive social and, to a lesser extent, economic impacts that could generally be expected from measures at EU level aimed at promoting the societal functions of sport through action in core areas, i.e. *health-enhancing physical activity, social inclusion, education and training, and voluntary activity* (e.g. leading to healthier and more inclusive societies as well as to enhanced employability). Strategically oriented and coordinated policy approaches as provided for under Options B and C and in particular an OMC (Option C) are likely to strengthen these positive effects. Further political efforts to *fight doping* involving relevant stakeholders at national, European and international levels is likely to have an indirect positive effect in terms of an improved image for sport in society and credibility for sporting competitions.

New action aimed at policy coordination in other areas, such as support for sport structures (e.g. action aimed at ensuring *sustainable financing* of grassroots sport) potentially has positive economic impact in terms of more stable and better adapted sport structures in increasingly competitive markets, which potentially enhances the quality of sport services, which in turn can help to ensure people's access to local sport structures. Political approaches to tackle discrimination in sport (e.g. action in the field of *free movement of sportspeople*) can have a positive impact on the functioning of the Internal Market and can also help avoiding discrimination of EU citizens. Policy action aimed at more *legal clarity* regarding sporting rules through increased understanding about the application of EU law to sport thanks to specific guidance at EU level is likely to have a positive impact on the functioning of the Internal Market, as it potentially helps the sport sector to develop its activities within a sound legal framework. It can also help avoid tensions between different actors or legal conflicts. Support aimed at improving *EU dialogue and cooperation* structures can lead to better cooperation with stakeholders as well as inclusive and transparent processes. Experience from other sectors, e.g. education, culture, youth, shows that political support for developing an *evidence base for the EU-27* can lead to better informed national and European policy making based on sound economic reasoning, for instance regarding public spending or investment decisions. Access to information of sufficient quality can equally benefit other actors, such as sport organisations, which have to ensure sound economic management of their activities.

Regarding environmental impacts, the report recognises that sport, in particular large sport events, can to some extent negatively affect the environment. All options, although to different degrees, can potentially promote environmentally friendly approaches.

Each of the options is then assessed in terms of the likelihood that the most important and desired positive impacts will occur and their magnitude. The most important impacts are identified to be threefold: *improvement of public health, social inclusion of disadvantaged groups, and contribution to employability and jobs*. The likelihood and magnitude is generally found to be higher for Options B and C than for Option A given the strategic political framework and new actions foreseen under these options as compared to the baseline.

b) The efficiency of Option A has been assessed very low, despite the positively rated human resources implications and despite the fact that the Commission would have the systemic capability to deliver. The reason for this assessment are the high likelihood that this Option

would not reach desired impacts and the fact that a mere continuation of ongoing activities appears to be difficult to justify in light of the new Treaty mandate that explicitly calls for EU action in the field of sport. In contrast to Option A, Option C requires proportionately high inputs in terms of human resources, while the likelihood of this option to reach desired impacts is high to very high. An improvement of efficiency must therefore be assumed for Option C in relation to the baseline. Regarding the ability to deliver, there is to date no experience with launching an OMC in a new horizontal policy area like sport. At this early stage of formal EU cooperation in the field of sport, there is not yet sufficient evidence for a developing consensus for an OMC. Option C's ability to deliver has therefore been rated negative in comparison with the baseline. The assessment of efficiency of Option B comes to a more balanced result as regards both the relationship between impacts (high likelihood of reaching desired impacts) and inputs (no additional human resources needs). Moreover, the ability to deliver has been rated very high as compared to the baseline, given the stated support from governments and stakeholders for the approach suggested under Option B. Overall efficiency for Option B has therefore attained the highest score among the options.

c) Regarding its effectiveness, each option is assessed with regard to the strategic objective (new strategic approach to EU-level cooperation in sport) and the seven specific objectives that the initiative aims to achieve. Option A does not meet the strategic objective and only makes a very limited contribution to achieving the specific objectives. Options B and C, through the creation of an EU framework for sport, can reach the strategic objective. Concerning the achievement of objectives related to core areas where an OMC can most likely be implemented, the effectiveness of Option C is rated higher than that of Option B. Similarly, through targeted actions foreseen in the EU Agenda for areas aimed at tackling objectives relating to fairness and openness in competitions, dialogue and cooperation in sport, and regarding more clarity on the application of EU law to sport, Option B must be rated higher than Option C. As an aggregated score, the likelihood of Option C to reach the objectives is assessed to be slightly higher than that of Option B.

d) The coherence of the options is assessed with regard to the overarching goals of the Europe 2020 strategy, the EU Health Strategy and the functioning of the Internal Market. Option A, given the lack of any new action, is not considered to be coherent with the overarching goals. Options B and C both make a contribution to growth and jobs, public health, and to the Internal Market. It is assumed that a long-term policy approach providing for an OMC is a slightly more coherent approach to reach general EU policy goals, in particular those relating to Europe 2020 (by helping the sport sector develop its full growth and jobs potential), which is expressed in the slightly higher value of Option C in comparison with Option B.

### **Comparison of options / choice of preferred option**

The following chapter of the report summarises the comparison of the options in light of the four criteria based on the assessment of impacts, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence.

- The positive economic and social impacts of Options B and C are likely to be similar, while the new EU Agenda, provided for under Option B, seems particularly conducive to furthering them. The level of impact can be expected to be slightly higher under Option C, that would result in an OMC for certain core areas of EU-level cooperation in sport (e.g. health-enhancing physical activity).

- Concerning efficiency, Options A must be rated very low. Despite a much higher level of inputs, Option C is likely to be more efficient as compared to the baseline, but more difficult to deliver. Option B is more efficient than the baseline and more efficient than Option C. Moreover, the Commission's ability to deliver desired impacts reaches the highest score under Option B.
- Regarding effectiveness, the attainment of the objectives cannot be guaranteed under Option A, while Options B and C both reach the strategic objective and the specific objectives. Option C is likely to produce slightly higher effects.
- Regarding the coherence criterion, Option A is not conducive to achieving the EU's overarching social and economic goals while Options B and C can both make a valuable contribution. Option C, providing for an OMC, is considered the most suitable instrument.

The impact assessment concludes that Option B is the most appropriate way to respond to the challenges faced by sport in the EU and to implement the sport provisions of Article 165 TFEU. Option B is the most balanced option and the one that is likely to provide the greatest net benefits in this phase of developing the EU dimension in sport.

On this basis, the Commission will propose a **Communication defining a policy framework for cooperation in sport at EU level, including a new EU Agenda for sport**. The Communication should also announce an Impact Assessment for a possible EU Sport Programme from 2014 onwards, in order to complement the cooperation framework.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

Finally, the impact assessment presents an overview of the planned steps regarding monitoring and evaluation, notably by listing a first set of core indicators of progress towards meeting the general and specific objectives pursued by the proposed initiative (Option B). Part of the proposed EU framework for cooperation in sport will be an evaluation in 2015, which should provide an opportunity to consider the possible introduction of an OMC for certain aspects of cooperation in sport at EU level.