

*There was a seven-year window from the time of award of CWG-2010 to New Delhi to its execution, which was not appropriately utilised. The time window from November 2003 to mid-2006, which could have been effectively used for planning, clearances and approvals, was wasted. The OC itself was registered only in February 2005, while EKS was appointed by the OC as the consultant for preparation of venue briefs and site plans only in July 2006. This led to cascading delays in all subsequent activities, since the return briefs, concept designs and detailed designs and drawings for venues could be prepared only thereafter. Even thereafter, specifications and designs for venues continued to be revised by the OC and International Sporting Federations till late stages.*

*The finalisation and approval of the two key planning documents for the Games – the General Organisation Plan and Games Master Schedule – were delayed by more than three years. Operational plans for different Functional Areas (FAs) as well as other planning documents of the OC were also delayed substantially.*

*A comprehensive, over-arching plan identifying the requirement of city infrastructure and gaps therein for hosting the Games was essential for ensuring an integrated perspective. However, we found evidence of only a presentation to the Committee of Secretaries in December 2006, which could, at best, be termed as an approach to an infrastructure development plan, without the necessary level of detail and rigour. Detailed planning for state-of-the-art city infrastructure for CWG-2010 was substantially delayed, and was done in an ad hoc fashion without a “bottom-up” assessment of needs and requirements. We also found indications of “stop-start” planning and implementation in several areas. Further, the delayed planning resulted in adequate time not being available for obtaining statutory clearances from various agencies.*

## 5.1 Overview

The last international multi-sport event held in India was the IX Asian Games held in November- December 1982. Since then, there had been massive changes in the scale, format, presentation, technology and the funding model associated with such events. All the agencies involved

(Ministries/ Departments of GoI, GNCTD, OC and others) were handicapped by the lack of experience in organising an event of this magnitude, and were dependent on the advice offered by a host of consultants, as well as the CGF and its representatives. This also resulted in requirements being identified/ amended in an ad hoc and sporadic manner, often at a late stage.

## 5.2 Seven Year Window from Award to Hosting of Games not utilised

The CWG is awarded to a candidate city by the CGF at its General Assembly seven years in advance of eventual hosting. The seven year window (from November 2003 to the hosting of the Games in October 2010) was identical to the time available for organising other such mega multi sport international events such as the Melbourne CWG 2006, the Beijing Olympics 2008 and the London Olympics 2012; this facilitates adoption of a phased approach. For example, the organisers of the Beijing Olympics 2008 and the London Olympics 2012 followed a three-phase approach:

- 2 years for planning and approvals;
- 4 years for execution, construction and developments; and
- 1 year for test events and trial runs.

The bid document for CWG-2010 of May 2003 envisaged a four phase approach, as under<sup>1</sup>:

Phase I	Plan	January 2004 to May 2006
Phase II	Create	May 2006 to May 2008
Phase III	Deliver	May 2008 to December 2010
Phase IV	Conclude	December 2010 to March 2011

<sup>1</sup> The General Organisation Plan (GOP) approved in August 2007 indicated a four phase Games Planning Process – Plan, Mobilise, Execute and Legacy, but without indicating timelines for each phase, which made this “phased” approach largely meaningless.

### Phase-wise approach not implemented

As reported by us in our Study Report of July 2009, we found no evidence of the four phase approach being translated into action during the first phase years of 2004 to 2006, nor during a major portion of Phase-II. In effect, project implementation did not follow the phase-wise approach envisaged. Both planning and execution commenced only in late 2006. These delays had a cascading effect on all subsequent activities.

The non-utilisation of the time windows between November 2003 and mid-2006 and the consequent compression in the remaining time available are depicted below:

#### Waste of time window between November 2003 and mid-2006

Date	Event
November 2003	Award of Games to Delhi; signing of HCC
September 2004	Constitution of GoM
October 2004	Decisions to constitute Apex Committee and International Sports Division (ISD) of MYAS
January 2005	Constitution of CoS
February 2005	Registration of OC
March 2005	Constitution of Apex Committee; signing of HCC by OC
May-July 2006	First meetings of CoS, Apex Committee and CoS; creation of ISD

### Compression of time available due to inaction upto mid-2006

Time Line	January - June 2004	July - December 2004	January - June 2005	July - December 2005	January - June 2006	July - December 2006	January - June 2007	July - December 2007	January - June 2008	July - December 2008	January - June 2009	July - December 2009	January - June 2010	July - December 2010	January - June 2011	
<b>Plan</b>	Plan				Create				Deliver							Conclave
<b>Actual</b>	No significant planning activity				Planning		Planning and Creation		Planning, Creation and Delivery							Conclave

### 5.3 Delayed Finalisation of General Organisation Plan (GOP) and Games Master Schedule (GMS)]

Under the HCC, the two key planning documents for the Games - the General Organisation Plan (GOP) and the Games Master Schedule (GMS) - should have been finalised by the OC and approved by the CGF by May 2004 (i.e. within 6 months of the HCC).

#### Importance of GOP and GMS

The General Organisation Plan (GOP) is a high level master planning document, which sets the structural framework and timelines for the overall organization of the Games. It is to articulate the way the Games would be planned and delivered, including the allocation of responsibilities. Importantly, it considers all stakeholders involved in staging the Games (not just the OC), including those responsible for development of facilities and infrastructure.

The GMS is a roadmap, which lays out the detailed timelines for starting and completing various activities in a coherent and co-ordinated manner.

#### Delayed Finalisation of GOP and GMS

As pointed out in our Study Report of July 2009, the GOP and GMS were finalized for CGF's approval only in August 2007 and November 2008 respectively.

In fact, the GMS was also revised and altered several times. During the finalization of our Study Report, the OC responded that the planning of the Games was challenging and complex, and planning documents continued to evolve till Games time due to evolving dependencies between functional areas and delivery partners.

Delay in preparing and finalizing the GOP and GMS by more than three years critically affected preparations for the Games; this was compounded by the "evolutionary" planning process, arising out of changes in requirements at late stages.

## 5.4 Delayed Finalisation of OC Plans

### 5.4.1 Operational Plans of FAs

The GOP scoped the Games Project into 34 Functional Areas (FAs), with clearly demarcated activities and objectives. Operational plans had to be prepared for each of these functional areas.

#### Delayed Preparation of Operational Plans

**As of May 2009, draft operational plans had been prepared for only 16 out of 34 FAs. Subsequently, in response to the draft Study Report, OC stated that all the 34 Operational Plans had been finalized, and CGF approval would be obtained by the revised deadline of 31 August 2009.**

We found that many of these Operational Plans underwent subsequent revisions, and some plans were finalised only after the conclusion of the Games. Further, in many FAs, these plans were not actually operationalised and remained theoretical inputs, and the actual activities of the FA differed significantly from that indicated in the Operational Plans.

### 5.4.2 Other Planning Documents

In addition to the GOP and GMS, the HCC also stipulated several planning documents and strategies, which required CGF approval. We found that in some cases, the plans remained just plans and were not translated into action e.g:

- Plan for international and national business programme;

- Corporate hospitality plan;
- Sponsor servicing strategy;
- Plan for exploitation of commercial rights

## 5.5 Planning for Venues

For ensuring proper planning of venue specifications and timely execution, a phased approach was decided by the Infrastructure Co-ordination Committee of OC in August 2007:

Stage	Timeline
Venue appraisal study by OC consultant and submission of venue brief to owners	December 2006
Submission of return brief and concept design by venue owners	May 2007
OC's approval of concept design and complete final design	June - July 2007
Start of construction	Sept. 2007
Completion of construction	December 2009

#### Importance of Venue Brief and Approval

In simple terms, the venue brief prepared by the OC consultant (EKS) described the sporting and other requirements for each completion and training venue, incorporating the specifications of the respective International Sporting Federations.

On the basis of this venue brief, the venue owners/ implementing agencies, assisted by their consultants, were required to

prepare return briefs and concept designs, which indicated how they proposed to translate the venue brief into reality. After approval by OC/ EKS, these were to be further developed into detailed designs and drawings, on the basis of which works could be tendered and awarded and construction commenced.

### Delayed Finalisation of Venue Specifications

**As indicated in our Study Report of July 2009, there were delays at all stages of the above process. Further, final specifications and drawings were still being revised and modified in mid-2009, and had not yet been frozen. Also, all approvals granted by OC were only of a conditional nature.**

Even after our July 2009 Study Report, officials of implementing agencies indicated that there were further changes to the specifications and drawings at the instance of OC, although documentation of such late changes could not be produced to us.

## 5.6 Delayed Finalisation of Plans for City Infrastructure

One of the objectives of CWG-2010 was to develop state of the art city infrastructure. These were to be undertaken by a multiplicity of agencies principally under three different jurisdictions – NDMC, MCD, and PWD (GNCTD). It was essential that a comprehensive, overarching plan identifying the requirements of city infrastructure (and the gaps therein) for hosting the Games be prepared and approved at the highest level.

In response to our request for a copy of a comprehensive city development plan

specifically for the requirements of CWG-2010, GNCTD indicated that in June 2004 itself they had taken up with the Finance Minister the need for a specific allocation of funds to fulfil the requirements of the city government for CWG-2010. This was followed by a letter in May 2005 to MYAS, indicating department-wise details of the requirement of additional funds and its justification. In the 9th meeting of the GoM in January 2006 (where the list of competition venues for sports disciplines was finalised), it was decided that GNCTD should include all its requirements covering city infrastructure and venue infrastructure in its proposal to the Planning Commission. Subsequently, a committee headed by Member Secretary, Planning Commission and including representatives of GNCTD finalised a list of infrastructure projects which was presented at the CoS meeting held on 12 December 2006. GNCTD indicated that the presentation (consisting of 66 slides) titled *“Preparing Delhi for 2010 and Beyond – Making it a world class capital”* made to the CoS constituted a comprehensive city development plan for CWG-2010.

We do not agree with GNCTD's response. The presentation merely touched on issues such as

- Modernisation of the airport, and connectivity thereto (metro/ road/ bypasses);
- Metro and road connectivity to JLN Stadia, Games Village, NOIDA, Airport etc. and proposed 24 flyover/ bridges and 12 car parking sites;
- Upgradation of Connaught Place and areas surrounding New Delhi/ Old Delhi Railway stations, Chandni Chowk/ Jama Masjid; and
- Large scale requirements for drainage, sewage, solid waste management, water, power supply

## Chapter 5 - Planning

At best, the presentation to the CoS meeting of December 2006 could be termed as an approach to an infrastructure development plan for CWG-2010, without the necessary level of detail and rigour.

We found that detailed planning was done in an ad hoc fashion without an integrated perspective, and without a “bottom-up” assessment of needs and requirements. It was also substantially delayed.

Roads, bridges and flyovers constituted critical city infrastructure for meeting the requirements of CWG-2010. We found that there was lack of clarity about identification of projects directly linked to the Games. In the meetings of the Empowered Committee, the Chief Secretary had reviewed as many as 86 projects. However, in a post-Games consolidation and review exercise, he only identified 25 projects as directly related to the Games. No documented plan for the selection of these projects (after appropriate inter se prioritisation and sequencing) could be provided to us.

We also found indications of “stop-start” planning and implementation in several areas:

- Action for renovation and restoration of Connaught Place was initiated in 2004, but the revised DPR was finally approved only in November 2007.
- The plan for streetscaping and beautification was initiated in 2004, but action for appointment of consultants was initiated only in 2008. Planning for street furniture was initiated even later (after receiving the reports of the streetscaping consultants).
- Planning for improved streetlighting was initiated in 2006, but re-activated only in 2007.
- The need for improved signages was highlighted in February 2006, but the

pilot project was initiated only in May 2008, with works being awarded only in 2009.

Delayed planning was a key reason for many infrastructure projects, envisaged to be completed in time for the Games, not being completed in time. Further, such delayed planning resulted in non-availability of adequate time required for statutory clearances from various agencies e.g DUAC, ASI, MoEF/ Forest Department etc. (given the normal time required for due diligence on proposals by these agencies).

We also derived the impression that planning and selection of projects was, to an extent, driven by the perceived availability of funds for Games-related projects, rather than a strictly need-based analysis.

**While many of the completed projects resulted in a substantial upgradation of city infrastructure, such a process reflected an ad hoc approach, often with a dilution of focus/ priorities on the requirements for CWG-2010.**

## 5.7 Planning for Other Activities

Planning for other supporting activities was also substantially delayed:

- Cabinet approval for funding for media and broadcasting services was finally received only in October 2008.
- GoI approval for MTNL as the telecommunications service provider for the Games was received only in September 2009.
- Approval for funding arrangements for the Internal Security System for the Games was communicated only in September 2009.