

## Questions from Play the Game to Bent Flyvbjerg et al. about their study of the costs of Olympic Games

### Questions:

*”**Mixing budgets:** When the IOC claims that the study mixes operational and capital costs, they do not specify whether they mean sports-related infrastructure or wider infrastructure. Relying on the quote we would argue that the IOC is technically right when they say that the study mixes the budget from the organisation of the Games and the infrastructure budgets (but only the sports-related infrastructure budget)*

*(Q1) Your answer suggests that you understand the critique to only be a matter of sports- and non-sports related (wider infrastructure) costs?”*

*”Further (Q2) can you comment on the thoughts behind not separating operational costs and sports-related capital costs in relation to this piece from our article:*

*“Peculiarly, the study does not specify the operational costs and sport-related capital costs separately. First, it would have been informative to the reader. Second, it is likely that the two budgets behave differently concerning cost overruns. However, despite it being standard practice, it is not mentioned in the study whether they have run separate models for the two types of costs.”*

*”**Infrastructure budgets serve only four weeks:** Although you do not state that the capital costs should be written off immediately after the Olympic Games, (Q3) we would argue that the paper de facto treats all sports-related infrastructure as a proportion of total Olympic costs. If not all the sports-related infrastructure should be recognised as Olympic expenses, then the total costs in table 1 (p. 27) may be overestimated. Do you agree?...”*