



Select Committee on the 2026 Commonwealth Games Bid

Hearing Date: 9 October 2023

Questions taken on notice

Directed to: Victoria 2026

Received Date: [Office Use]

1. Joe McCracken, page 71

Question Asked:

Joe McCracken: My first question is to you, Peggy. I mean, we have seen it in the media today as well. There are extracts of a letter that I think you might have sent to then –

Peggy O'NEAL: Yes, I have heard that. I did not know.

Joe McCracken: No, I just saw it before as well. I think it was dated 4 April or thereabouts.

Peggy O'NEAL: Yes.

Joe McCracken: Are you happy to provide that to the committee, that letter?

Response:

The OC is awaiting a response from DJSIR in regards to whether this letter can be released or is under Executive privilege. Please direct any further requests for information in relation to this letter to DJSIR.

2. Joe McCracken, page 72

Question Asked:

Joe McCracken: Do you have a copy of the, what did you say, 27 February budget submission?

Peggy O'NEAL: That went to our board.

Joe McCracken: Are you able to provide us with that as well? Because I know what –

Peggy O'NEAL: It is just our slice of what the overall budget would have been.

Joe McCracken: Yes, that is okay.

Peggy O’NEAL: But it is at the bottom of the letter, so if I can release the letter, it is there.

Response:

Please refer to the response to question 1.

3. David Davis, page 76

Question Asked:

David DAVIS: The second thing I would say is on 2 May there was a budget update to the board, with a budget of \$1.777 billion. Was that the same as the submission in February?

Jeroen WEIMAR: ... The increase – the \$1.768 billion – that we submitted on 22 February, my belief is, is an increase of \$722 million, but I will take on notice any countback on those numbers.

Response:

On 22 February 2023, the OC presented its budget submission to the Office of the Commonwealth Games, requesting net public sector funding of \$1.768 billion.

On 2 May, the budget submission update was presented to the OC board requesting net public sector funding of \$1.777 billion.

On 10 June, the OC’s final budget submission was presented to OCG requesting net public sector funding of \$1.626 billion.

4. David Davis, page 78

Question Asked:

David DAVIS: Just moving to Geelong, you have obviously got redundancy costs now, which you have referred to.

Jeroen WEIMAR: Yes.

David DAVIS: We would appreciate any information on those costs too, but on notice.

Response:

The following table provides information on employees terminated after 1 August 2023.

Grade	Number of individuals	Total value excluding superannuation (\$)
Executives	34	3,044,820

Non- Executives	48	1,272,085
Total		4,316,905

5. Melina Bath, page 86

Question Asked:

With the local government, if there is a table of their concerns maybe that you could prepare for us – the various locations and what the local government raised as issues. It would be helpful, I think, for this, particularly when we are speaking to them as well.

Response:

No further information to provide upon review of the transcript of Jeroen Weimar’s verbal response during the 9 October hearing.

Additional questions on notice:

1. CGA gave evidence to the Senate inquiry that it advised the state government that various sports could be moved. Specifically cycling and swimming.

- a. Did CGA make those representations to the OC?

Response:

CGA had informal discussions regarding venues at the CGF Coordination Commission in April, 2023.

If so when and in what form?

As above.

- b. Did the OC explore any options to move the venues of any sports?

Response

The OC explored a number of options in relation to venues as part of routine scenario planning for alternative budget outcomes and other unforeseen events.

- c. If so which ones?

Response:

Options for all venues were considered as part of routine scenario planning for alternative budget outcomes and other unforeseen events.

- d. When was this exploration to move some venues undertaken?

Response:

From March 2023 onwards, options for all venues were considered as part of routine scenario planning for alternative budget outcomes and other unforeseen events.

- e. Did the OC discuss potential options with the Melbourne & Olympic Parks Trust outside of the Opening Ceremony?

Response:

No

2. The OC's submission to this inquiry noted "the OC inherited a series of significant decisions."

- a. Apart from seeking to increase the budget, did the OC take any actions to try and persuade government to change announced locations of sports and ceremonies?

Response:

The OC did not formally seek changes to locations from the Victorian Government.

- b. If yes, what was the response of the OGC and other State government partners to these requests?

Response:

Not applicable.

3. There was a commitment from the government to have Kabaddi as an exhibition sport for the Commonwealth Games. What progress was made on that front prior to the cancellation?

Response:

The OC was not contractually responsible for the delivery of exhibition sports or other non-Program sports. As Kabaddi was an exhibition sport, it was outside the OC's delivery responsibility.

4. With regards to major sporting displacement costs, which sports and venues?
- a. What compensation payments were identified? Were they fixed costs?

Response:

The OC commenced early discussions with a range of venue owners but had not yet identified displacement costs.

- b. The questionnaire from the Kardinia Park Stadium Trust indicates venue hire would be payable but does not mention displacement costs. Is their questionnaire incorrect?

Response:

As above.

5. With regards to the accommodation shortfalls, when did you become aware this would be an issue?

Response:

Key constraints in accommodation were identified by the OC at the start of September, 2022.

- a. Were holds put on local accommodation providers?

Response:

The OC had initial engagement with local accommodation providers in November 2022. No formal contracts had been entered into at that stage.

- i. If so, can you provide the committee with a list?

Response:

Not applicable.

- ii. When were those holds cancelled?

Response:

Not applicable.

- iii. How were providers informed?

Response:

As there were no contractual agreements in place, the OC did not contact accommodation providers when the Games were cancelled.