



## Culture, Media and Sport Committee

### Oral evidence: The 2022 World Cup Bidding Process, HC 577

Tuesday 22 July 2014.

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 22 July 2014.

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Mr John Whittingdale (Chair), Angie Bray, Tracey Crouch, Paul Farrelly, Mr John Leech, Steve Rotheram, Jim Sheridan

Questions 1-124

*Witness:* **Greg Dyke**, Chairman, Football Association, gave evidence.

**Chair:** Good morning. This morning's session is a follow-up to the inquiry that the Committee held in 2011 into the bidding process for the World Cup in 2018 and 2022, although, particularly in the first session this morning, we might touch on one or two other matters as well. I welcome the chairman of the English FA, Greg Dyke. Tracey Crouch will begin.

**Q1 Tracey Crouch:** It was reported back at the beginning of June that you thought that Qatar should have the World Cup 2022 stripped from it. Do you still believe that?

**Greg Dyke:** No, I don't think that was what was reported. What I said at the time, which I stick to, was that if Mr Garcia's report showed that there had been corrupt activity in the process of awarding those bids, the whole thing should be reconsidered.

**Q2 Tracey Crouch:** Is that view shared by other football associations?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Tracey Crouch:** You sound a bit hesitant.

**Greg Dyke:** Well, it is not shared by all other football associations; there are 209 altogether. It is certainly shared by some others in Europe.

**Q3 Tracey Crouch:** Qatar suggested that there was a conspiracy by other countries or those with vested interests to strip them of the World Cup. Are you part of that conspiracy?

**Greg Dyke:** I can't see that it is necessarily to our benefit. If you are going to be involved in a conspiracy you would normally think there was something to your benefit. There is no benefit to England in stripping the World Cup, and we are not saying that it should be. We have never said that the World Cup should be stripped. We have said that if Mr Garcia's report demonstrates that there was corruption, then clearly the whole process should be looked at again. We are not part of a conspiracy at all.

I think what you have seen from within FIFA as a reaction to *The Sunday Times* articles is basically a very defensive response in which Mr Blatter says that FIFA is under attack. I don't see it that way. I read all the articles in great depth and I thought they were interesting. What we were asking at that time was, could you assure us that all this information is available to Mr Garcia? Has he seen it? If he hasn't seen it, could you make sure that he has seen it? At the congress in Sao Paulo Mr Garcia said he had seen a great deal of it and would consider the rest.

**Q4 Tracey Crouch:** The Garcia report was originally scheduled to be with FIFA at the end of July. Have you heard any reports that it will not be ready for reading at the end of July?

**Greg Dyke:** I think it will go to the ethics committee. As I understand the process, it would go from the ethics committee to the judiciary chamber and it will reach them in the first week of September. The results are expected to be published in October, but that does not necessarily mean that the whole report is going to be published.

**Q5 Tracey Crouch:** I was going to say, it was suggested yesterday that the report itself might not be published. Do you have any concerns around transparency as a consequence of it being fully published?

**Greg Dyke:** I think the FA's view will be straightforward. We would like to see the whole thing published, but clearly some things would have

to be redacted. Other than that, we would like to see the whole thing published and not just the recommendations of the judiciary chamber, but, as I understand it, they will take at least a month with it before making any decision or recommendations on what should happen.

**Q6 Tracey Crouch:** May I briefly ask you about 2018? Do you have any concerns about Russia hosting the World Cup? Do you agree with some of the calls that have been made over the last few days that, in light of recent events, particularly the downing of MH17, maybe Russia should be stripped of its opportunity to host the World Cup?

**Greg Dyke:** I think that has to be looked at over a much longer term than the next week or two. I—and we—would have a view that that is much more in your field than in ours. If we go around the world and every time something is awarded it gets stripped, you are going to be in trouble. I think that is your area more than it is ours at this particular moment. Obviously, we are within a week of this disastrous event, so I think you have got to wait and see how things play out.

**Q7 Tracey Crouch:** It is a very interesting response, but football and politics have been intrinsically linked for some time. Do you think that perhaps in future World Cup bids things like humanitarian records or political stability should be taken into consideration when decisions are made on which countries should host the World Cup?

**Greg Dyke:** What we believe—and it will happen in the future, we are told—is that the technical report needs to be considered much more greatly and that will include political stability. It will also include how hot it is.

**Tracey Crouch:** So you are quite happy at the moment for Russia to—

**Greg Dyke:** We were never happy, because that was the one we were bidding for, but I don't think you can make a decision based upon one week's events without looking at it in a much longer-term perspective. I think the technical report needs to be a very important part of the decision and that does include the political stability.

**Q8 Chair:** Are you resigned to the World Cup being held in Qatar in the summer of 2022?

**Greg Dyke:** No. I am certain it won't be held in the summer of 2022.

**Chair:** You are certain it won't be held in the summer?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Q9 Chair:** Do you think it will be held in Qatar in the winter?

**Greg Dyke:** There is no chance now that it will be held in the summer of 2022. The discussion is about when else it is held.

**Chair:** When, not where.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Q10 Chair:** How will that affect the English football season?

**Greg Dyke:** It will depend when it is held, but if it is held in November and December, or in January and February the following year, then the football season will have to stop for two months.

**Q11 Chair:** Is the Premier League in agreement with you about this?

**Greg Dyke:** I think the Premier League know that it will not be held in the summer and, therefore, they are looking at what will be the best time for them. But so are other people. For some countries in Europe it will be better to hold it in January and February because they have a mid-season break then anyway, so I think that those sorts of discussions and negotiations are going on. If you ask me now when I think it will be held, I would say that it will probably be in November and December.

**Q12 Chair:** Is the view that it will not take place in the summer of 2022 now universally accepted?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Q13 Steve Rotheram:** In regard to Qatar, with its kafala system of tied employment and with the standard of health and safety not having been the highest, do you agree that, as well as the considerations about the Premier League being disrupted, those and other such mitigating

circumstances should be considered when bids are put in to host future World Cups?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, I agree with you entirely.

**Q14 Jim Sheridan:** Just following on from Steve Rotheram, can you give us a flavour of the discussions that go on when the bids are being discussed? Qatar has already been reported as exploiting migrant workers who have to work in extreme heat with a lack of health and safety and so on. Is that a factor among the decision makers?

**Greg Dyke:** I can only observe—like you, I was not involved and I was not there. What is clear from last time is that the report on safety—not in terms of building the stadium, but in terms of heat—was ignored; there is no doubt about that. In the technical report there was advice that said there were serious concerns about holding a World Cup in the summer in Qatar and that was ignored.

**Q15 Jim Sheridan:** Should that be part of the criteria?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes. In the future I think that the system will change. Instead of just the executive committee members voting for it, everyone will have a vote. At the moment there are 209 members, so they would all be able to vote. What we do not know yet is how much that will come down to being part of the big federations, so you do not know whether it is going to be UEFA and others—

**Q16 Jim Sheridan:** You seem to suggest that the whole question of health and safety and so on was discussed but ignored.

**Greg Dyke:** I am not even sure that it was discussed.

**Jim Sheridan:** Should it be discussed in the decision making?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, and that is what has now been agreed. We will see if it happens, but in future the technical report, which encompasses all those things, has to be a significant part of the discussion. The technical report basically said, "Don't give it to Qatar."

**Q17 Paul Farrelly:** Presumably if the World Cup is held in the middle of the Premier League season, we will not be able to say that, come the summer, our players are too shattered to get very far.

**Greg Dyke:** You could say that that is an upside.

**Paul Farrelly:** But clearly—*[Interruption.]*

**Greg Dyke:** Should they qualify, yes. Otherwise we have got a big, two-month gap with nothing to do.

**Q18 Paul Farrelly:** But clearly as far as you are concerned, and possibly other countries, it is a case of not just when, but perhaps where, if, as you say, the Garcia report shows widespread corruption. Do you have any concerns about what the Garcia report will and will not take into account?

**Greg Dyke:** No, I think Garcia is a reputable lawyer. He was asked to do a report, and he interviewed everybody involved. As I say, it would have been much more helpful if FIFA, the day after *The Sunday Times* articles came out, instead of being defensive, had said, "Look, Mr Garcia has already seen some of this." Certainly, as a result of *The Sunday Times* articles, Mr Garcia was asked to present to the FIFA congress. He was clear that he had seen quite a lot of it before and that he was willing to take anything new into account, although he said he would not postpone the process.

**Paul Farrelly:** Okay. You have heard that first hand?

**Greg Dyke:** From Mr Garcia.

**Q19 Paul Farrelly:** The suggestion in *The Sunday Times* articles is that he was not going to take all that into account, which would have been absurd.

**Greg Dyke:** It would have been ridiculous. As I say, he said two things: first, that he had seen quite a lot of it; and, secondly, that what he had not seen would be taken into account.

**Q20 Paul Farrelly:** Do you have any concerns about who he is and is not taking evidence from—for example, Mr Bin Hammam?

**Greg Dyke:** The discussion about the Garcia report, it seems to me, is going to be about whether what Mr Bin Hammam was doing was aimed at supporting Qatar's World Cup bid, or whether it was aimed at his own bid to be the president. That is going to be the interesting part of Garcia's report. I am in no better a position than you to know.

**Q21 Steve Rotheram:** There has been a plethora of accusations and allegations of nefarious behaviour by certain members of FIFA. What would it take for FIFA to reform and reinvent itself, as the IOC did following the Salt Lake City scandal?

**Greg Dyke:** Some things have happened, as I understand it. Personally, I am a great believer in age and term limits. I think there is a limited amount of time that people should sit on the FIFA executive. We voted for that, but most of FIFA voted against it in Sao Paulo. They voted against age limits as well, but we voted in favour of both. It would be interesting to see whether they come back again, but that sort of reform is needed to ensure you get a proper turnover of people.

**Q22 Steve Rotheram:** Don't you think it needs a more fundamental root-and-branch reform of the whole structure?

**Greg Dyke:** You have got to separate the management structure from—

**Steve Rotheram:** The governance structure.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, the governance structure. Yes, I think it probably does need that reform. A new president will hopefully do that and commit himself to looking at the whole structure.

**Q23 Steve Rotheram:** And should that new president be the current president? Would he have the confidence of the FA and the British football authorities?

**Greg Dyke:** Well, it was interesting that in Sao Paulo a lot of the European FAs made it clear that they do not support him. However, I am afraid that there is still overwhelming support from the rest of the world.

**Q24 Chair:** If he runs again?

**Greg Dyke:** Oh, if he runs again, he'll win.

**Chair:** He'll win?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Q25 Chair:** But you will vote against him?

**Greg Dyke:** That is not my decision. The FA has got to make that decision. We have not discussed it yet as an organisation.

**Chair:** Your personal opinion?

**Greg Dyke:** I think it is unlikely we would vote for him.

**Q26 Chair:** And would you do any more than just not vote for him? Would you seek allies to form a voting bloc?

**Greg Dyke:** The president of the Dutch FA has already stood up, as has the president of the German FA. I think there is quite a lot of movement in Europe, but I'm not sure there is much movement around the rest of the world. There are places, but if Mr Blatter stands again, he is likely to win. That is the consensus view.

**Paul Farrelly:** I think David Bernstein has committed himself to opposing Blatter's re-election.

**Q27 Steve Rotheram:** Chair, I think it is interesting why he may well win. Again, there are allegations that he is siphoning money into football authorities and countries to buy their votes. Would you agree with that?

**Greg Dyke:** Well, he announced at Sao Paulo that there would be an allocation of \$750,000 to every FA around the world and some are obviously much bigger than others. I would hope that if you had a new president at some stage you would look again at the way the money is allocated, which could be to our detriment. But does the English FA need \$750,000, whereas you can go to some very large countries where they could do with significantly more than that? It would seem to me a more rational process to not just give \$750,000, regardless of the size and the need.

**Q28 Mr Leech:** The whole process of Qatar winning the bid suggests that either the allegations of bribery and corruption are true and therefore the whole executive should be sacked, or they were incompetent in the decision-making process about where it was suitable to hold a World Cup and therefore they should all be sacked. Which is it?

**Greg Dyke:** I couldn't answer that until we have seen Mr Garcia's report. The question you have to ask is why you would put the World Cup in Qatar in the summer because it doesn't meet most of the criteria for the bid. The argument back would be that you were trying to take football

into areas where football hasn't always been the biggest sport. But why would you need eight stadiums in Qatar? It is a small state. Why would you take it to a place where, forget about whether they are air conditioned, for the fans Qatar in the summer would have been impossible? So you do have to ask why they decided to do that. If you look at the executive at the time—two of them had gone before—but seven or eight of them have since resigned because of corruption.

**Q29 Mr Leech:** Is it not a bit irrelevant whether it is corruption or incompetence? Either way, the people who made the decision shouldn't be in post.

**Greg Dyke:** No one believes it was the right decision, or very few people believe that now. Should they be in post? I think you have to say that probably a lot of them took the decision on the basis that they thought it was the right decision at the time.

**Q30 Mr Leech:** It was interesting that in one of your earlier answers you said that the World Cup will not take place in Qatar in the summer.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Mr Leech:** By definition, either it will be at a different time in the year or it will be somewhere else.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Q31 Mr Leech:** Why has no one considered the possibility of forcing Qatar into creating indoor stadiums and changing the rules so that we could play the World Cup in the summer, indoors and in properly air-conditioned stadiums?

**Greg Dyke:** I think they would but the real problem will not be that. If you have been to Qatar in the summer you can hardly walk in the streets. Therefore the recommendation of the health and safety people was that it wasn't safe. Certainly I don't think it would be safe for fans.

**Mr Leech:** So even if you sort out the conditions for football and watching football you still don't think it would be possible?

**Greg Dyke:** No, because I think air-conditioned stadiums are one thing, but you've only got to go to a World Cup and look at the amount of

time it takes you to get in and out of stadiums and all the rest of it. To move around fans who are out on the streets is quite dangerous in Qatar in the summer.

**Q32 Mr Leech:** Does it not show then that regardless of whether the allegations of bribery and corruption are true, FIFA has shown no commitment to the welfare of football and the welfare of football fans and it is all about politics and money?

**Greg Dyke:** Well, it certainly took the wrong decision to hold a World Cup in Qatar in the summer. I think that's widely accepted now as having been a flawed decision. It was a democratic vote in the sense that everyone round the committee table had a vote. It now turns out that some of those were—a number have now resigned after allegations of corruption. We will see what Mr Garcia says about the rest.

**Q33 Mr Leech:** But will the changes that have now been implemented, meaning that the decision will be made by 209 people instead of 24, not—

**Greg Dyke:** And they will not make two at the same time. That's the other decision; they will not make two at the same time because two at the same time clearly leaves the opportunity for deals.

**Q34 Mr Leech:** Does that mean that the future decision-making process will be more transparent or less transparent? Or does it just mean that it will cost more to buy a World Cup because more people have to be bought?

**Greg Dyke:** I don't know—if you're asking if it's a better system, it's certainly better to have it one at a time. It's certainly better to have more votes but the vote is pretty strange because very small federations of FAs will get a vote. Everyone gets a vote. I think it probably is a better system. Whether it will actually produce the results we want, I don't know.

**Q35 Mr Leech:** One last question: you mentioned earlier the need to take more consideration of the technical reports as part of the decision-making process.

**Greg Dyke:** FIFA has decided that.

**Mr Leech:** Would it be better to have a preliminary bidding process whereby countries submit evidence as to whether they can actually host a World Cup, and then go through a bidding process once you've established whether a country is suitable to have a World Cup in the first place?

**Greg Dyke:** I think that was effectively supposed to happen anyway.

**Mr Leech:** There's not much evidence that it happened.

**Greg Dyke:** But so much of it is about politics as opposed to the technical side—I agree with you. I suspect what should have happened is you go through the technical bid and, if you're not going to pass the technical stage, that's the end of it.

**Q36 Mr Leech:** If that were to happen and proper consideration was made of the technical bid, roughly how many football associations would actually be able to host a proper World Cup?

**Greg Dyke:** I have no idea. It's expensive. It costs a lot of money for a country to host a World Cup, particularly if you're going to build a lot of new stadiums, because FIFA don't pay for them. So there's obviously a limited number who could actually host it. The problem we've got—the problem England's got—is that it's certainly Mr Blatter's view that the English media is such that, "Why would you want to take it to England?" He made that very clear at the bid last time. As I say, he saw what I thought was a perfectly legitimate piece of journalism by *The Sunday Times* as an attack on FIFA. He then—that was what really upset me—started accusing *The Sunday Times* of racism in front of the African nations. It seemed to me that it was nothing to do with racism; it was to do with corruption.

**Q37 Chair:** Do you not think that that, in itself, essentially rules him out as a credible figure to lead FIFA into the future?

**Greg Dyke:** Well, that's an opinion. In the end, 209 football federations and associations will vote next year on whether or not he is to stand again. That was my first ever FIFA congress, and I found it quite amusing in the sense that it reminded me more of something out of North Korea at times than something from the rest of the world, only in the sense that it was, "Hail to the leader." The Brits aren't like that—quite the opposite, actually.

**Q38 Tracey Crouch:** I want to follow up on something that you said earlier in response to John. You said it was universally accepted that the World Cup would not take place in the summer. Does that mean the bid was won on false promises?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes. Well, no, that's not fair. Qatar would still be very happy to stage the tournament in the summer. FIFA has decided to change it.

**Tracey Crouch:** I have been following this relatively closely, and this is the first time I have heard so categorically the opinion that it is universally accepted that it will not happen now in the summer. Have you given the Committee a big headline?

**Greg Dyke:** No, it is quite clear it is not going to happen in the summer. Everyone now knows it is not going to happen in the summer. The discussion is about when you do hold it.

**Q39 Jim Sheridan:** Can you tell us in general terms what the views of the other home countries are? Do they support your view?

**Greg Dyke:** I think you should ask them that. It would be unfair of me to say they support my view. I think they agree that it cannot be held in Qatar in the summer, but I would not commit them to everything else I've said.

**Jim Sheridan:** They were talking about votes in other European countries. Did other home countries support you when it came to the vote?

**Greg Dyke:** I made a speech at the UEFA meeting in Sao Paulo when Mr Blatter was there. I basically said that I objected to him calling *The Sunday Times* report racist, because I thought it was not racist at all; it was a piece of good investigative journalism. That's where my background is, anyway. I do get a bit tired of it—that every time that anyone ever criticises FIFA, they see it, or Mr Blatter does, as an attack on the organisation. So would they support us in that? I think they probably would, yes.

**Q40 Paul Farrelly:** From what you are saying, it sounds as though winter or spring is a done deal, because you and other influential football nations simply will not take part in the summer, and therefore FIFA has no choice.

**Greg Dyke:** No, I think, generally, everybody came to the conclusion: you could not hold this thing in the summer, which comes back to Ms Crouch's question of, "Hang on. Why did nobody think about this two years earlier when they were actually awarding it?"

**Paul Farrelly:** So this is not opinion; this is fact.

**Greg Dyke:** This is fact. This thing will not be held in the summer in '22.

**Q41 Paul Farrelly:** On to my real question: I think it is rather fanciful—unless football figures here in this country were trousering bribes or inducements—even had all this happened or should anything else happen after the commencement of the Bribery Act here, that this country is the appropriate forum to pursue FIFA. But FIFA, of course, like so many organisations, is based in Switzerland, and this has been going on for a long time. *The Sunday Times* has been producing different allegations about corruption in FIFA for a number of years now. Have you heard any squeak out of the Swiss authorities during all this?

**Greg Dyke:** No, but to be fair, I've never asked, so—

**Paul Farrelly:** You don't have to ask to hear.

**Greg Dyke:** No, I haven't heard anything.

**Q42 Paul Farrelly:** This is a question that I will put to *The Sunday Times* reporters later, but does that beg the question as to whether Switzerland is an appropriate country for a sporting organisation like FIFA to be based, if the Swiss authorities take no action when there are pretty well-founded accusations of bribery and corruption?

**Greg Dyke:** We must wait for Mr Garcia's report to see what it says and what we can find out from it, but if you go back to the Olympics analogy, it was the sponsors in the end and American actions in the American Senate that brought about a change in the IOC. I've got to tell you—and this might come as a shock—that I don't think action by the British Parliament is going to make any difference to FIFA at all, because they already think you're the enemy, just as they think the British media are the enemy. It is one of the few things that unites us all.

**Paul Farrelly:** We don't have to wait for Mr Garcia's report to have a go at Switzerland, do we?

**Greg Dyke:** No, we don't.

**Q43 Paul Farrelly:** One of the interesting suggestions from *The Sunday Times* reporting is that bin Hammam was quite adept at covering his own back by taking legal advice as to whether what he was considering doing was illegal under Swiss law. The suggestion was that it was not. I will ask *The Sunday Times* reporters later. That speaks volumes about Switzerland, don't you think?

**Greg Dyke:** What you are suggesting, almost, is that FIFA runs above the law.

**Paul Farrelly:** Yes, and whether the law is adequate in Switzerland.

**Greg Dyke:** To be fair to FIFA, Mr Garcia was a reputable lawyer who had been brought in to do a proper report, and we are all waiting for that.

**Paul Farrelly:** I will pursue this later.

**Greg Dyke:** I don't think you can just say it's a whitewash.

**Paul Farrelly:** No, I'm not saying that. It is a question of whether Switzerland is an appropriate country, really.

**Greg Dyke:** It's not an area—

**Paul Farrelly:** Shouldn't FIFA have moved lock, stock and barrel?

**Greg Dyke:** I think it's not likely. I think the tax arrangements at FIFA seem to suit everybody—in Switzerland, they seem to suit everybody.

**Q44 Chair:** You've already indicated that you think that the Garcia report should be published in full, apart from one or two maybe sensitive areas.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, it just depends on what—the qualification would be on what grounds they took certain evidence.

**Chair:** What if it isn't?

**Greg Dyke:** We will ask for it.

**Chair:** What if they say no?

**Greg Dyke:** Then I hope *The Sunday Times* gets hold of it.

**Chair:** *The Sunday Times* is very ingenious and might well do so, but essentially what I am saying is—

**Greg Dyke:** We, as the FA, will ask for the report.

**Q45 Chair:** If you go on, as the English FA, maybe supported by the Dutch and Germans, saying, “This body stinks. Something has got to change,” and you make absolutely no progress whatsoever because of a large blocking majority from other parts of the world, at what point do you say, “We’re not going to go on with this”?

**Greg Dyke:** I think we’ve already taken the decision that we will not bid for FIFA tournaments—and there’s a whole range of FIFA tournaments: different age groups, women’s football and others. We have taken a decision that we will not bid for those while Mr Blatter is the president, because we wouldn’t win. We need Government support for most of them, and I am not sure that is forthcoming, so our decision is that we will concentrate in the years ahead on trying to host UEFA tournaments rather than FIFA tournaments.

**Q46 Chair:** But England not bidding to host tournaments is not going to cause much loss of sleep to Sepp Blatter. Would you, as the English FA, at any point say, “We are going to withdraw from FIFA because this organisation is corrupt from top to bottom”?

**Greg Dyke:** If we were on our own, no. You’d make a big headline one day and that’s it.

**Q47 Chair:** You would need to find allies. Could you actually find other football associations, such as the ones you have mentioned, who would join you?

**Greg Dyke:** There are other ways which I think we would try first, which is: can we work from the inside to get it changed over a period of time?

**Q48 Chair:** Just to give you one example, Steve mentioned Salt Lake City. One of the things they did there was make it absolutely clear that in future no member of the IOC executive should be allowed to accept any money at all. It seems bizarre that that rule does not apply in FIFA.

**Greg Dyke:** No, it would seem pretty obvious—well, do you mean accept any money from any of the bidding—

**Chair:** Yes.

**Greg Dyke:** Oh yes. That would seem pretty obvious to me, yes.

**Chair:** And yet that is not in place.

**Greg Dyke:** No, but I don't enough of the detail of the ethics that they have now introduced. They have certainly looked at it since last time. Last time around, you are exactly right.

**Q49 Chair:** The impression that we have is that, despite 11 pages of detailed evidence from *The Sunday Times*, followed up by further revelations in following weeks, plus all the accumulated evidence, you get one sentence saying, "This is the racist British press," and nothing happens. How much longer can that continue?

**Greg Dyke:** The question that we asked immediately afterwards was, "What has been given to Garcia? Has Garcia got all this information?" Because if he has and he is properly considering it, that is all we can ask for at this stage.

**Q50 Chair:** Will you see a full copy of the Garcia report?

**Greg Dyke:** I'm not certain that we will, no.

**Chair:** So even you, as the chairman of the English FA, may not actually see the full coverage of this investigation.

**Greg Dyke:** No. We will ask for it to be published in full, as I said, with a bit redacted if it is difficult for Mr Garcia.

**Q51 Angie Bray:** I have to say, I think you have been choosing your words very carefully this morning, for reasons that I am sure we understand, but for most people like me, it is fairly clear from what you have said, however carefully you have spoken, that the whole set-up around FIFA has seriously gone beyond a joke. I just wonder what you think can be done to rescue it. At the moment, it sounds like you are painting yourself rather like the Prime Minister with Mr Juncker recently, where we knew what we thought was right and wrong but nobody else was vaguely interested—apart perhaps from Hungary. It is a lone voice of common sense. You are saying that nobody else takes the blindest bit of

notice and they plough on. So what can you ask them to do to try to improve things?

**Greg Dyke:** It's not a lone voice because, as I said, the French, the Germans and others in Europe—Mr Platini himself has now come out and said he no longer supports Mr Blatter. We can continue to press for the changes we have been pushing for for some time. Now, ask, "Have some changes been made?", erm—

**Angie Bray:** You sound a bit helpless, if I may say so.

**Greg Dyke:** Well, we are a bit, yes: we are one vote among 209.

**Angie Bray:** Football deserves better, frankly, doesn't it?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, except you've just seen a remarkably good World Cup, which was very well organised by the executives of FIFA—not the executive committee; so you've got this separation between the people who run FIFA and the executive committee. I think the executives of FIFA should be applauded for the World Cup that they have just run, but when eight members of your committee have had to resign because of allegations of corruption, there was clearly a need for fundamental reform. We believe there's still a need for fundamental reform; we believe that could come about with the appointment of a new president. Mr Blatter was due to leave—

**Angie Bray:** Yes, well, we're not going to get that, are we? That's the point.

**Greg Dyke:** We're not going to get it for four years, so we have to then say, "Right, working through UEFA, what else we can effect?" I think for the FA to stand and say, "We're going to try and change it ourselves, on our own," is a waste of time.

**Q52 Angie Bray:** Should there be some kind of rule passed that limits the number of terms that somebody like Mr Blatter or anyone can serve?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes.

**Angie Bray:** And is that something that you think you could get agreement on, generally?

**Greg Dyke:** No.

**Angie Bray:** So again, we are back to the position where we can change nothing. The only thing we could do is walk away and say, "D'you know what? A plague on all your houses", because this is not good for our football.

**Greg Dyke:** We could all say that we are unhappy with the way FIFA operates—or has operated in the past. When Mr Blatter said that he was not going to stand again, we thought that was the right thing. We thought it was a mistake that he should stand again, having said that it was not his intention to stand again, but the influence of the English and of the British is quite limited. It is more limited, perhaps, than others, partly because of the openness of our media.

**Q53 Angie Bray:** Well of course, and he has chosen to criticise in that way precisely because perhaps we are potentially more damaging to him because we are prepared to speak up more than some other countries, which is particularly why he has made us a target.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, and I think if you look through the list of people who have resigned because of corruption, *The Sunday Times* and the BBC come up quite regularly. Now, if what you see, as the president of that, is, "That's an attack on our organisation", then clearly—it's a bit sad that organisations, when they are put under that scrutiny, respond in that way.

**Q54 Angie Bray:** What I am taking from all this is that, actually, we are not prepared to make a stand and there are so few others that would join us even if we did that the whole thing is pointless, in which case—

**Greg Dyke:** What do you mean by a stand? Do you mean walk out of FIFA?

**Angie Bray:** Possibly say, "This organisation is not 'fit for purpose'," to use that awful phrase.

**Greg Dyke:** I think we can say the organisation is not fit for purpose; that doesn't necessarily mean walking out of FIFA. As I said, you have got to separate the executive—the running of FIFA—and the executive committee.

**Q55 Tracey Crouch:** Why shouldn't we walk out of FIFA? We're not very good at the World Cup, so what's in it for us?

**Greg Dyke:** I think because a week later everybody's forgotten you. It's like most resignations—he says, having done one himself.

**Chair:** We haven't forgotten you.

**Greg Dyke:** No, but you get remembered for a week and then you move on, don't you? I don't think that sort of gesture politics would help. Trying to reform through UEFA should be the process.

**Q56 Steve Rotheram:** Wouldn't it be better, instead of throwing your dummy out the pram—like the Prime Minister tried with Juncker—to try and build alliances, not just through UEFA, but also through the Commonwealth associations? That can get to some of the countries that are benefiting, if you like, from the moneys that are being thrown towards them.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, and we have quite close relationships with quite a lot of people, and we have people who work on that. But as I said, I went to a congress for the first time and saw the adulation that is offered to the leader. We are not used to it here.

**Q57 Paul Farrelly:** Is UEFA clean?

**Greg Dyke:** As far as I know, yes.

**Paul Farrelly:** Because you would have to have confidence that that was the case.

**Greg Dyke:** As far as we know. Mr Platini says quite openly he voted for Qatar—he's never denied that—and he says he did it for footballing reasons. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that anything else is the case.

**Q58 Chair:** But you said earlier that, on footballing grounds, it was almost impossible to think of any reason to vote for Qatar.

**Greg Dyke:** That's my view, yes.

**Chair:** So what do you make of Michel Platini?

**Greg Dyke:** The only legitimate view is to say that you are taking a big footballing tournament to a new area—which is the argument for Russia and it was the argument for South Africa. I'm not sure that that argument is strong enough for Qatar, when you look at the downsides.

**Q59 Paul Farrelly:** I asked whether UEFA is clean because there are quite a lot of Europeans on the executive committee of FIFA.

**Greg Dyke:** There are.

**Q60 Paul Farrelly:** One of the interesting recent revelations, as the World Cup started, is that after agreeing to reduce or get rid of bonuses, instead the executive committee members' salaries were doubled. Why do people representing UEFA take any salary or any bonuses at all from FIFA? Why are they not simply remunerated by UEFA and why do they not act, as in other organisations, as delegates of UEFA?

**Greg Dyke:** Because they're not delegates of UEFA; they are there because they are members of UEFA and they are elected by members of UEFA—by the FAs in UEFA. That's why I think term limits are a good idea—because you want turnover in those sorts of jobs.

**Paul Farrelly:** Shouldn't UEFA say, as a policy, "Those people we elect to FIFA will not take a salary or bonuses"?

**Greg Dyke:** They could do.

**Paul Farrelly:** Should they?

**Greg Dyke:** I don't know about the bonuses—I don't know enough about, actually what they receive. You probably know more than I do.

**Paul Farrelly:** I only know what I have read. Jim Boyce from Northern Ireland is the vice-president of FIFA.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes. He leaves this year, I think. Somebody from the four British federations sits on the FIFA executive as one of the European members.

**Q61 Paul Farrelly:** And have the four home unions—as they call them in rugby—ever said that their representatives should not take a salary and will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses by the home countries?

**Greg Dyke:** I don't know that.

**Paul Farrelly:** Shouldn't we set an example?

**Greg Dyke:** Mr Boyce goes next year, and the four either have to decide among themselves to put up one candidate, or there can be different candidates and then the rest of UEFA can decide. But one of those places belongs to the British.

**Paul Farrelly:** But you see what I mean? Be it a mini or a maxi North Korean People's Congress, it would be less so if the people taking part were not subject to inducements, salaries and the like from FIFA. The next time we nominate someone to be a vice-president, shouldn't we say that we will ensure that he does not take a salary or bonuses?

**Greg Dyke:** We should certainly ask the question, I agree.

**Q62 Jim Sheridan:** Greg, notwithstanding your earlier comments about not bidding for any future FIFA competitions under Blatter—hopefully when Blatter is away, that will change—would it be helpful if we put in a British bid to host the World Cup? Before the tartan army park outside my door, I say that with the safeguards there to protect the home countries' individual identities. Would it be helpful to have a British bid?

**Greg Dyke:** I don't think, under the bidding process, it would make much difference. I think it is accepted that the English bid for 2018 was the best bid. Technically, I think it is accepted that that was the best bid. We managed to get one vote, other than the one that we had some influence over because he was English. If you can't get your own people to vote for you, you should finally call it a day, shouldn't you? We got two votes from that executive. Whether we would do better under the new system, I don't know. Could the four federations agree on that? I don't know. If it gave us a better chance of winning, I am certain we would do it.

**Q63 Steve Rotheram:** Why are we so disliked?

**Greg Dyke:** Where?

**Steve Rotheram:** Obviously, by other countries not voting for us—only one country supported us—if it was the best bid.

**Greg Dyke:** As I say, I wasn't part of it, so I can only read as you have read. I have asked that question this morning: why didn't we win? I have asked that question a number of times. I think—

**Steve Rotheram:** That's a slightly different question. Why aren't we liked?

**Greg Dyke:** Why aren't we liked? We are not liked—

**Q64 Steve Rotheram:** Does it have anything to do with previous instances of football hooliganism? That was titled "the English disease" when it was far from being an English disease; it was a European-wide disease if anything, and far beyond that. Instances of violence are much more prevalent in other countries than they are, and ever have been, in the British game.

**Greg Dyke:** No, I think it is much more to do with the British media. This is not a criticism, but if you go through the list of who has resigned and why, a disproportionate number have resigned because of work that was done by either the BBC or *The Sunday Times*. I think that—

**Steve Rotheram:** So by exposing corruption, they are getting back at us?

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, and certainly Mr Blatter said at the time, "This is the scrutiny we are going to come under if we go to England."

**Q65 Chair:** Can we just move on to a couple of subjects before we finish? First, you will be aware that this Committee has twice conducted quite lengthy inquiries into the future of football governance in the United Kingdom and that we made some pretty strong recommendations that were accepted by the Government. Indeed, the Government then said that they were minded to legislate if those were not followed through. Why has that not happened?

**Greg Dyke:** I read both your reports. I have been a year as chairman of the FA. When I became chairman of the FA, I looked at what I thought were the priorities. For me, the single biggest priority was how do we get stronger England sides going forward, particularly men's sides, and my other significant concern was about the number of foreign players now playing in this country. Some 70% of the Premier League and 50 % of the Championship are now foreign players, and every year it gets worse. That has two consequences. First, it makes it quite difficult, and will make it harder as the years go by, to get a good England side—

**Chair:** I actually want to come on to that and I know Tracey wants to ask about the England side, but I want specifically why have there not been—

**Greg Dyke:** Okay. I was just explaining what I have done with my year so far. My year so far has been looking at that. I have meetings this week looking again at governance.

**Q66 Chair:** We have understood that, in the past, while the FA has been quite sympathetic to the kinds of reforms we have been calling for, you have encountered an absolute block from the Premier League. Is that still the case?

**Greg Dyke:** Some of what you suggested has happened: there is now an independent chairman who does not come from either the professional game or the national game; there are two independent non-exec directors; and the size of the board has come down. All of those things were recommended by this Committee. Is that the end of it?

**Q67 Chair:** They were reforms in the right direction, but they did not go to the full extent.

**Greg Dyke:** No, as I say, over the next six months, I am planning to look again at the way the FA operates and the governance of the game.

**Q68 Chair:** So you are still hopeful that you can bring in the reforms without the Government having to legislate, as they have said that they will if that does not happen.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, because I do not think that they will legislate.

**Chair:** The Government are clear in having said that they will.

**Greg Dyke:** They didn't do it, though, did they? All I am saying is that saying that you will legislate is one thing, but doing it is different. I read both reports in great depth when I first got the job. I think that further change is needed, and it will be best if we can try to do it from within, as opposed to being forced into it from without.

**Q69 Paul Farrelly:** One of the nicer things about the former Sports Minister sounding off before the election about football here, and then, after the election, not having a clue what to do about that and chucking it into the lap of this Committee of busybodies, was that we got to go to Germany to look at what they were doing. In the Bayern Munich boardroom, I remember clearly Karl-Heinz Rummenigge saying that it

was very simple: Germany learnt from Spain; Spain learnt from France; and France learnt from Holland. And we see who won the World Cup this time.

One of the things we did not cover in our report, because it is about how the game is played, is something that you came out with that happens in Germany, but which you got shot down for, which is that the big clubs play their B teams in the lower leagues without being able to be promoted, which gives home-grown players more game time.

**Greg Dyke:** I think virtually all of the German squad bar two had played in B teams.

**Paul Farrelly:** You can't win, can you?

**Greg Dyke:** The game is not over yet. We did come up with a set of recommendations of which that was one. The others—at some stage, it would be very helpful to have you support—were about spending money on all-weather pitches, coaching—

**Paul Farrelly:** Coaching is important.

**Greg Dyke:** Yes, but I think that facilities is a big issue in this country. You say that you went to Germany, but look at the figures for all-weather pitches in Germany compared with here and there is a massive difference. Why is that? Because it was an obligation on local authorities in Germany at one stage.

**Q70 Paul Farrelly:** But on that big idea about the B teams, the opposition is not the Premier League, but the Football League.

**Greg Dyke:** Actually, it is the bottom two divisions of the Football League. Everyone always wants change until it is change in their area. I do not rule it out. When our report came out, a lot of the Premier League clubs, and particularly their managers, read it and were totally in favour of the analysis. Everybody believes in the analysis; it is just what you do about it. The analysis basically said, "Look, we have got a serious problem in this country because our players do not play overseas."

It is quite clear that in Germany there is an unwritten agreement about the number of German players who play in the Bundesliga. No one writes it down because it is contrary to European law, but it is quite clear that it is there.

**Q71 Steve Rotheram:** In regard to the Government crying wolf and the FA ignoring those threats, what would make you do what was in the Committee's recommendation?

**Greg Dyke:** I think we have to look at it in a different way and say, "What are the purposes and aims of the FA? What are our priorities? How do we make sure that that's what we're prioritising?" That, I think, includes image and governance.

**Steve Rotheram:** Is it within your gift to do that, or are there external influences that are preventing you from doing it?

**Greg Dyke:** Who do you mean by "you"?

**Steve Rotheram:** Well, you, as the external influence on the FA.

**Greg Dyke:** There are lots and lots of constraints put on by different structures within the FA. I am hoping we can take the board of the FA on the process to doing this and then recommend it to the rest of the FA and the rest of football.

**Steve Rotheram:** We will be watching.

**Q72 Tracey Crouch:** I was going to ask you a little bit about the lessons that can be learned from Germany, but I think Paul has covered most of it, so I will ask you this. Has Roy Hodgson been subject to a performance review since Brazil?

**Greg Dyke:** I think he's been on holiday. What we are looking at is—perhaps we are on the front and middle now—what we need to change. That discussion will be happening in September.

**Tracey Crouch:** What do we need to change?

**Greg Dyke:** I'll tell you after the process.

**Q73 Tracey Crouch:** Do you still support the way the England manager is hired or fired?

**Greg Dyke:** Oh yes. I thought Roy Hodgson did quite a good job. I've got a lot of time for him, and I think he's a good guy. It was interesting: there was a poll out yesterday showing that 80%-odd of the British population thinks he should have kept his job. He had a four-year contract; we are on a journey. I think it's unfair to pick on him. One of English football's big problems is that the average Premier League

manager lasts 12 months, if you take out Arsène Wenger. Therefore, their ability to look long-term is quite limited. If you are a football manager in England, your first priority is sorting out your contract when you go in, and your second one is sorting out your contract when you go out, because of the speed of turnover. That cannot be good for English football. That is why we are of the view that Roy had a four-year contract and we wanted to continue that contract. We think some progress was made, but we are now going to say, "Okay, are there more fundamental changes we need to make?" That is what we're going to look at in September.

**Q74 Chair:** You indicated earlier that you saw one of the biggest potential difficulties facing the game as the proportion of foreign players at the very top. What can you do about that?

**Greg Dyke:** Well, you could lobby to change the European legislation. When the Bosman ruling went through, it fundamentally changed our ability to say, "You've got to limit the number of foreign players and European players." We are going through all the rules again on non-European players, and we will come up with some new proposals, but even then, it is quite difficult. If I am Brazilian, I can go to Portugal, get a passport and be here in two years. It is the same in Spain if you are Argentinian. It is quite difficult. We are looking at that, because we think that among some great players whom we want to be here, there are an awful lot of bog-standard players. The real problem—we went around a lot of the big clubs and talked to the people who run their academies—is that there is no pathway for 17 and 18-year-old English boys to get through the system.

**Q75 Tracey Crouch:** Is the Premier League the right structure for being the training ground, if you like, for the England squad?

**Greg Dyke:** In the sense of the system they've put in—EPPP and all the rest of it—and the amount of money now being spent, yes, it probably is, but the question is: what happens when you reach the age of 17 or 18? The gap between there and the first team is now bigger than ever, and there is nowhere to go, so people drift away and drift off. That was why we came up with B teams in the lower leagues—to let in kids—but that will be part of progression; then it will probably be loans in the Championship. There is a progression.

Everybody, of course, says, "It's not my problem." That is why I say it was interesting that the coaches and managers of a lot of Premier

League sides came out in favour of what we were saying, because they recognised the problem.

**Q76 Tracey Crouch:** But is it not a bit topsy-turvy that you get big, Premiership clubs that scour the grass-roots game and pluck some eight-year-old talent out from a local team, shove them into an academy, build them up to a particular point and then basically say, "Sorry, we don't want you anymore," so that they get farmed off or lost for ever? Would it not be better to support the grass-roots game and improve it from the bottom up, and develop players that way into the Premier League, rather than the big names plucking talent at a young age and then shoving them out?

**Greg Dyke:** I think you have to do both, but even if you did that, it would not overcome your problem. If they are a genius, they are going to get through, because they always will, but there is a large number of young, talented players who go into Premier League clubs and through their academies, but the gap is too big and they can't find a way through.

I talk to people who acquire players for Premier League clubs, and they will tell you quite openly, "Look, I can find bog-standard players cheaper overseas than I can here." That is not about their kids getting through, but it is a problem that the kid in the Championship, say, doesn't get acquired anymore. There is a fundamental blockage that we have to do something about. Now whether we have the power and whether we could do it, we will see.

**Q77 Tracey Crouch:** Without those changes, do you think we will ever win a World Cup again?

**Greg Dyke:** You can never say never, but it's difficult. Only 30% or 31% of the players in the premier league are qualified to play for England. What you are really interested in is the top six clubs, and last year it went down to 23%. If you look at the transfer activity this year, a couple of Southampton players have gone to Manchester United and Liverpool, which in some ways is quite good news, though not for Southampton, but everyone else is coming from overseas. Do I think we will ever win again? I think it's going to get tougher and tougher unless we do something about it.

The person who introduced the Bosman legislation—I haven't got with me exactly what he said—basically said, "I don't believe this is going to stop the development of young players in different countries." Well, he was wrong in England, because it has.

The other problem we have is that none of our players play overseas. If you look at the Germans, it is not only the 50-odd per cent. playing in the Bundesliga, but those playing in Spain and a large number here. We don't have that.

**Chair:** Greg, I know that you have to get away, and we have another session, but John and Paul, ten seconds each.

**Q78 Mr Leech:** Your plans for B teams were widely criticised by lower division teams, but did you do any work on the impact in terms of potential additional revenue from extra gate receipts and TV revenue?

**Greg Dyke:** We did a bit. The plan was that the Premier League would pay for this. I was chairman of a lower division Football League club for seven years, and it wasn't unknown to turn up at a board meeting and need to have a whip-round to make sure you could pay that month's wages. A lot of those clubs are in deep financial difficulties. The deal we thought we could do was to put B teams into the lower leagues and, in exchange, the Premier League would give a significant increase in the money going to those leagues.

I am afraid that the economic reality did not hit home. People were saying, "You're going to damage our structure." Personally, I don't think it would have damaged the structure at all; I think it would have enhanced the structure. We looked at what it did to gates—we looked in Spain, Germany and Holland—and it didn't damage them at all.

**Mr Leech:** I was thinking that it would actually increase gates with the likes of Liverpool, United and City going to away grounds.

**Greg Dyke:** The opposition was, "How dare you challenge the wonderful structure of English football wherein someone can start a pub team and eventually get into the Premiership." Well, that's not likely these days.

**Q79 Paul Farrelly:** Greg, in 10 seconds, I cannot talk about Stoke City's recruitment from overseas because of economics and availability, despite its massive investment in an academy, so I won't.

**Greg Dyke:** At some stage, someone who owns a Premier League football club is going to start asking why they are spending £3 million, £4 million, £5 million or £6 million a year and getting no result.

**Q80 Paul Farrelly:** I'll just leave it to this last question: is there one top question that we have not asked you this morning, but that we should have asked, and that you would have liked us to ask?

**Greg Dyke:** In the end, with the work we did in the commission, I ended up more worried than when I started, because I was thinking, "I don't know how to change this." It would be interesting if you investigated how English kids can get through, because they are not untalented. There is an argument that says, "These kids are not as good as foreign kids," but everyone running an academy will tell you that's not the case. What they will say is, "We have no route for them to go from here." I am glad it came up in the end, because that is a really important issue for two reasons: first, that is the way we will get a decent England team in future; and, secondly, those kids have got some rights. As very talented kids, they are being told from the age of about five upwards that they are superstars—as Ms Crouch said—but they are being lost later in their lives.

**Paul Farrelly:** Let's take it up.

**Chair:** Greg, thank you very much.

**Greg Dyke:** Thank you.

*Witnesses: Heidi Blake and Jonathan Calvert, The Sunday Times Insight Team, gave evidence.*

**Chair:** I begin by welcoming to the second part of the sitting Heidi Blake and Jonathan Calvert of *The Sunday Times*. Before we start, Mr Farrelly would like to make a declaration.

**Paul Farrelly:** I should declare that from 1997 to just about the turn of the millennium, before he went to the *Express*, I worked closely with Jonny Calvert at *The Observer*.

**Q81 Chair:** I would like to make an observation. On many occasions, this Committee has been extremely critical of the press and we have spent a lot of time examining abuses by the press, but I want to say that I thought it was an outstanding piece of work done by *The Sunday Times*—

**Heidi Blake:** Thank you.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Thank you.

**Chair:** —and it raised a lot of questions, which we are here to address.

When you last submitted evidence to us in 2011, after your first investigation into what had happened in the bidding process, it was based in large part on the evidence you had obtained from a whistleblower who, a few months later, completely retracted and said that the entire thing was untrue. What do you think happened to cause that?

**Jonathan Calvert:** That submission was also based on all our undercover work. At the time, of course, quite a lot of people were telling us that Qatar was paying for votes. She, in particular, says that she came under pressure from Qatar to retract her evidence and made a very public statement to that effect. She now says that she didn't, so it's very hard to weigh up—she has gone one way and the other.

**Chair:** It obviously allowed Sepp Blatter to dismiss completely the first stories that you wrote back at that time as being based on no evidence at all.

**Jonathan Calvert:** I am not sure that is true, actually, because that was only one element of it. The astonishing thing about that early investigation was that we had been going around asking people how we could secure votes for a World Cup. We went to four ex-FIFA executive committee members, who were among the 24 who would vote for a World Cup, and a former general secretary of FIFA, and they were all advising us that to win a World Cup vote, you had to pay money to the voters. They had no doubt about it. Within all that, people were also telling us—this was the first time we had come across it; at the time we weren't interested in Qatar, because we were much more interested in what was happening with the England bid—that actually Qatar would do very well because it was making these deals with particular voters in Africa at the time.

**Q82 Chair:** Just moving more up to date, you devoted 11 pages of the paper to this—that is almost unprecedented in terms of the depth of your coverage—in which you produced a huge amount of evidence detailing payments made by Mohamed bin Hammam to various FIFA executive members. You will be aware that the response of the Qataris is, "Look, whilst you have certainly produced evidence that he made payments, in actual fact he was making them to further his own ambition, and he had no linkage with the official Qatari bid committee." How do you respond to that?

**Heidi Blake:** We find that quite an extraordinary claim, because we have reviewed a huge volume of material, including bin Hammam's personal correspondence from his e-mail account throughout the entire period leading up to the bid, and then during his presidential campaign, and it is absolutely crystal clear that almost his sole focus in the two years in the lead-up to the bid was that he was campaigning for Qatar to win the 2022 World Cup. His correspondence with football officials, including the officials he paid, is focused almost entirely on that. In terms of his own ambition, he then goes on the following year to declare his intention to run for the FIFA presidency, but that is a very last-minute decision—he declared that something like two months outside the election, which took place at the end of May 2011. He declared his intention to run on 18 March 2011, and there is really nothing prior to that to suggest that he had any intention of running in that year, or that he was lobbying to that effect.

**Jonathan Calvert:** You don't see it at all in the documents, but on the other hand, you do see people writing to him saying, "We'll support your World Cup bid," and then linking it to payments that they're looking for from him.

**Q83 Chair:** I have seen the e-mails that you have published. Yes, there are a lot of e-mails from various people saying, "Thanks for the money—and, by the way, of course we'll support Qatar," which in itself is certainly fairly damning. However, given you had all those e-mails, there didn't appear to be any communication that you found between bin Hammam and the Qatar committee saying, "I've managed to line up so many so far." Would you not have expected to see that also?

**Heidi Blake:** We saw a lot of communication between bin Hammam and the leaders of the Qatar bid, and certainly a lot of communication about his lobbying campaign. He was arranging meetings for them with key voting members of the executive committee. He was reporting back to them on meetings that he was personally having with members of the executive committee. He was also, in one instance, bringing 35 African football bosses over to Doha on a junket, where he lobbied them over the World Cup bid, and that was paid for by the Qatar bid committee. So there is no doubt at all that they were working hand in hand with each other.

There isn't an e-mail or document that shows a direct instruction from anyone at the Qatar bid team for Mohamed bin Hammam to make a payment in relation to the World Cup bid, but it seems to us extraordinary that they could possibly not have known what he was up to, given how closely they were working with him, and if they didn't, it was grossly

negligent, because it was their duty to keep tabs on any of their associates and to ensure that any associate of the bid acted properly and within the rules. Clearly Mohamed bin Hammam acted entirely improperly and outside FIFA's rules, and it was the bid's responsibility to make sure that he didn't.

**Q84 Chair:** One final question before we move on: you said that you began the inquiry by looking at the 2018 bidding process and why we did so miserably badly. That, of course, was won by Russia. Did you see any evidence in the course of your inquiries to suggest that Russia had behaved improperly?

**Jonathan Calvert:** You can see things like collusion between Russia and bin Hammam. We see that at a late stage bin Hammam actually goes to see Putin just before the vote. We have previously reported that the Russians gave a painting to one of the voters, Mr Michel D'Hooghe, who is the Belgian member. He claims that that was not a valuable item; we just don't know. We know a lot less about the Russian bid than we do about the Qatari bid.

**Heidi Blake:** It is certainly something that we will continue to investigate because we have a large volume of documents. They centre on the activities of Mohamed bin Hammam, but we have certainly got correspondence between Mohamed bin Hammam and the Russian bid. As Jonathan says, there is evidence to suggest that there may have been some collusion between the two bids. That is something that we will continue to investigate. It is not entirely substantiated, but clearly Mohamed bin Hammam travelled to Moscow to visit the Kremlin and to discuss bilateral co-operation between Russia and Qatar in the field of sport in the days before the vote. That strikes us as a highly suspicious meeting.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Just to be clear, the possibility is that the Russian representative voted for Qatar and bin Hammam voted for Russia, which would be against FIFA's rules.

**Q85 Chair:** Is there more evidence that you already have but you haven't yet published?

**Heidi Blake:** We are still in the process of reviewing the documents. We have more evidence that we would like to go on to publish, but we want to investigate it further before we publicise it because we want to meet the standard of evidence that we would aspire to before we publish anything in the newspaper. This is something that

we will continue to investigate over the next few months. There will certainly be more revelations to come.

**Q86 Jim Sheridan:** On the question of these conspiracy theories, bin Hammam goes to Moscow to meet people—that happens. He goes and meets people all the year round. People give paintings as presents, etc., so what is different here?

**Heidi Blake:** The difference here is that, from what we can see from our documents, Mohamed bin Hammam was working on behalf of the Qatar World Cup bid, which wasn't something that he publicly admitted at the time.

**Jim Sheridan:** The Prime Minister was working on behalf of England.

**Heidi Blake:** That is true. We are very interested in the fact that there were secret meetings between Mohamed bin Hammam and the representatives of the Russian bid—and Vladimir Putin himself—at which they were discussing bilateral co-operation in sport at the same time as a number of lucrative gas deals were being negotiated between the two countries. We think it is certainly worth investigating whether there was any link between the two.

**Q87 Paul Farrelly:** I want to come on to Garcia, but you have got me curious now. Can you describe this painting?

**Jonathan Calvert:** No, I can't. All we know is D'Hooghe admits to having the painting. He said he put it in his attic and didn't think twice about. There are other allegations about giving paintings, but I won't go into them because they are not proved.

**Q88 Paul Farrelly:** You heard me talk to Greg Dyke about UEFA setting an example, and certainly the home countries, by saying, "Henceforth our people at FIFA will not be paid by FIFA at all"—nor accept paintings from anyone. Do you think that would work?

**Jonathan Calvert:** I think it would be wise not to accept gifts, especially when you don't know how valuable they are. It is quite extraordinary, as you say, that the FIFA executive committee are paid. They are all people who have jobs in their own federations, so they draw a salary and then get an extra \$200,000 just for attending those meetings through the year.

**Q89 Paul Farrelly:** John mentioned e-mails, which got me curious as well. No direct proof or e-mails between bin Hammam and the Qatar bid committee, but are all these emails from FIFA e-mail addresses with FIFA IP addresses?

**Jonathan Calvert:** No, a lot of the e-mails that we can see—a lot go, say, for example, from bin Hammam’s personal assistant, and what we then see is payment slips from his company, which was called Kemco, which he was using as a slush fund. He had about 10 different accounts within Kemco that he was using to pay all sorts of people.

**Paul Farrelly:** So there were private e-mail accounts, as well as FIFA accounts?

**Heidi Blake:** Yes, they come from a variety of different e-mail accounts. There are some e-mails in our possession—or that we have access to, rather—which are FIFA e-mail accounts. There are some from other organisations and confederations and football associations.

**Q90 Paul Farrelly:** From your investigation, FIFA simply cannot just draw the moral that, in future, do not use FIFA e-mail accounts, nor should it simply look at disaffected employees in their IT department.

**Jonathan Calvert:** No. One of the difficulties that we have is that when we go too deeply into the detail of the problems with the documents, it might reveal our source and we have to be careful—

**Paul Farrelly:** I would not dream of touching on that, curious as I am.

**Q91 Chair:** Can I just ask, although you may not be willing to say, do you know who your source is?

**Jonathan Calvert:** Yes.

**Chair:** You do. So you are absolutely satisfied about—that these are genuine, etc.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Yes.

**Q92 Paul Farrelly:** You heard what Greg Dyke had to say—from the horse’s mouth. Clearly, the implication, from when you were reporting, was that we did not know whether Garcia was going to take

what you were reporting into account or whether he had seen what you were reporting. Are you more satisfied now that Garcia is taking into account everything he should take into account and seeing, as far as is possible, all the people he should see?

**Jonathan Calvert:** No, not at all.

**Paul Farrelly:** Can you explain why?

**Jonathan Calvert:** Because we ran the first article on the Sunday. We rang one of his assistants on Monday morning and we talked to them, and they said they had not actually read our report, but Garcia would be making a statement that afternoon. Garcia made a statement in which he announced, out of the blue, that he was just cutting short the evidence-taking part of his investigation—in other words, sort of suggesting to us that he was not going to look at our allegations at all, and also suggesting that he had all the evidence that we had, which we find extraordinary. If he really had all that evidence, then he would not be doing what he is doing at the moment, which is sort of ruling out Mohamed bin Hammam from the whole inquiry. The fact is, he has not interviewed Mohamed bin Hammam; neither has he, say, for example, interviewed Jack Warner, who had direct payments from bin Hammam.

**Q93 Paul Farrelly:** Do you know whether he has asked to interview them and whether they refused, or whether he has simply not asked?

**Heidi Blake:** He has asked to interview Mohamed bin Hammam and Mohamed bin Hammam has refused to speak to him, but we do know from sources very close to his investigation that Michael Garcia and his team have entirely ruled Mohammed bin Hammam out of their investigation, because they believe that he had no connection with the Qatar bid committee. If he has seen our evidence, it is impossible to understand how he could have drawn that conclusion in any proper way, so that either suggests that he has not seen our evidence or his conclusion is inexplicable, because the links are absolutely clear. Because he has ruled Mohamed bin Hammam out—he is not interviewing him and not examining his links to the Qatar bid—his investigation is fundamentally flawed.

**Paul Farrelly:** But he cannot interview him if, as you say, he has asked and bin Hammam has refused.

**Heidi Blake:** This the problem that he faces, and it is because he conducted a previous investigation into Mohamed bin Hammam's activities, which resulted in Mohamed bin Hammam's life ban from world

football in 2012. It was during that investigation that he examined some of the evidence that we have seen, and on that basis he identified conflicts of interest and recommended this ban. His report was never published, so the reasons why he decided to ban Mohamed bin Hammam, no one knows; it is not clear. However, because he banned him for life, he then put him completely beyond the reach of any future investigations into his links with the Qatar bid, without having gone on to examine those links in further detail. So the whole process has been flawed from beginning to end, but if he has seen this evidence, he certainly ought to be asking questions about bin Hammam's links and his activities in the Qatar bid. At the moment, we don't believe he's doing that and therefore it's a bit of a nonsense to say we'll just wait and see what Michael Garcia says, because he's not looking at the relevant evidence.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Nor will we actually know what he said. So far, with all his investigations, all you find out at the end is that someone's breached a rule within FIFA; they don't explain why. For example, Parliamentary Standards goes through all the evidence and publishes it all, so we know what the allegations against them are and what the defence is. None of that happens with Garcia's investigations, and I don't think it's going to happen with this, although we do understand that the investigators themselves want it to be published, but we're told the decision on that will go to Sepp Blatter. He will presumably decide whether it's in his interests or not to publish it.

**Q94 Paul Farrelly:** Have you been approached by Mr Garcia or his team to share the evidence that you have with him?

**Jonathan Calvert:** We were sent a letter by Mr Garcia asking us for any further information which we thought would be relevant, which was so vague that we hadn't the foggiest idea what he was asking for.

**Heidi Blake:** Just to be clear, that took place after we had publicly criticised him on television, radio and Twitter for not approaching us to ask for our evidence. It was after we had spoken to his chief investigator and said, "We find it completely extraordinary that you're not going to look at this evidence," and had been told, "We don't think it's relevant, because we don't believe that he has any connection to the bid." We rattled their cage so much and said, "This is outrageous," that we got quite a cursory letter from him saying, "If you think you have any evidence that may be of interest to us, you're welcome to send it to us." We said, "We haven't even begun to review the hundreds of millions of documents we have, so we don't know what might be relevant, but you should be engaging with us properly." That was the last communication we had, but by that point they had already curtailed their investigation

and said they weren't gathering any more evidence anyway, so they shut the stable door and that was the end of that.

**Paul Farrelly:** Presumably it is quite open to him—because you've cited certain e-mails—to ask you very specifically, "Please let me have a copy of this." You could quite happily do that if you were satisfied they didn't have any identifying marks as to the source, but that has not happened.

**Jonathan Calvert:** We would be perfectly happy to do that, absolutely.

**Q95 Tracey Crouch:** Garcia said at a congress, I think a couple of months ago, that he already had the vast majority of material that formed part of your investigation. Do you not believe that?

**Heidi Blake:** We don't understand how he could possibly know that, because we don't even know the full extent of what we have—because there are hundreds of millions of documents and we've only read a small fraction of them, so I don't know how he knows. Our understanding is that what he's seen—we have some understanding of what they've looked at, because we do have sources close to his team—was documents coming out of the Asian Football Confederation that he examined during his investigation into Mohamed bin Hammam's activities. Those documents that he looked at, at that point, are a very small proportion of the documents we have, so we don't think it's true that he's seen all the documents we have. We don't see how he could know.

**Q96 Tracey Crouch:** But if his team came to you properly, not in a cursory way, and said, "We want to reopen the evidence-gathering aspect and would like to look at all your documents," would you allow them to do so?

**Heidi Blake:** We would have to go through the proper channels at the newspaper and the decision would not rest with us personally, obviously, but we would certainly be very eager to co-operate with any genuine investigation that FIFA cared to launch. At the moment, we think this investigation is horribly flawed and therefore we don't see how he has the time—and he certainly doesn't seem to have the inclination—to look at what we have. If he wants to engage with us properly, we'll be very happy to co-operate.

**Q97 Paul Farrelly:** So in your opinion, Greg Dyke is drawing some false crumbs of comfort from the words that he said he heard from Garcia.

**Jonathan Calvert:** We don't recognise that. We are not aware of Garcia working at all on anything that we revealed.

**Heidi Blake:** I think "false crumbs of comfort" is the right phrase. FIFA has very cleverly used Michael Garcia as a fireguard and said, "Michael Garcia will investigate. We'll all wait for his report, which will come out much later in the year." We've just heard again that there's going to be yet another delay in the report coming out—the report won't be published; it's a summary; maybe the evidence will not be published. There has been no proper scrutiny of the process, but by that time the heat will have died down and time will have moved on a little bit; so yes, I think it is false comfort. The people who are accepting that narrative from FIFA are not really being very rigorous with themselves.

**Jonathan Calvert:** The main preoccupation for FIFA at the moment, given that way that it is run, is getting Sepp Blatter re-elected. The last thing that Sepp Blatter wants to do is to have an investigation into all the federations and individuals in those federations who received payments, because they are the very people who will be voting for Sepp Blatter, come the election—I think it is next June.

**Q98 Chair:** Were you depressed to hear Greg say that he did not think he would see the Garcia report and that if Sepp Blatter ran, he would win and the most we could do is say, "Well, in future we won't bid to host any future tournaments"?

**Tracey Crouch:** And let's hope *The Sunday Times* get a copy.

**Jonathan Calvert:** We'd like that.

I think it is possible for UEFA—the Americans and the Australians feel the same way—to stand up and say to FIFA, "Hold on a second. This is just not good enough. You really have to get your house in order."

**Q99 Tracey Crouch:** From the evidence you have seen so far, do you think corruption is endemic in FIFA or is it just a case of a few rotten apples? If they do not publish the report in full, do you think that could be because corruption is wider within the organisation than perhaps many think?

**Heidi Blake:** I think corruption is endemic in FIFA, and the fact that the report will not be published is a big part of the reason. It is the culture of secrecy which allows corruption to flourish unchecked. They do not publish their remuneration of senior executives. The investigation that Michael Garcia is conducting is happening behind closed doors: the evidence is not all being recorded; interviews are not being recorded; there are no public hearings where witnesses are questioned publicly and the report and evidence will not be published at the end. The World Cup process was so corruptible was because it was a secret ballot and the 14 people who made the astonishing decision to vote for Qatar do not have to justify that decision to anyone because it is secret. So yes, corruption is widespread through the game and until FIFA becomes more transparent, it will continue to be so.

**Q100 Mr Leech:** You have seen a lot of evidence about the sort of things that go on in the bidding process. What fundamental changes need to be made to ensure that the process is clean and transparent in the future?

**Jonathan Calvert:** We have to know who votes for who. It is not like a general election: there are only a tiny number of people voting and they should be made accountable for their votes.

**Q101 Chair:** They have changed that now.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Yes, it is now going to be 209, but I still think that is a very small number.

**Heidi Blake:** It doesn't necessarily help. A lot of our evidence showed that Mohamed bin Hammam was spreading his money around the presidents of all of those national football associations. They will be the people who will now vote on future World Cup decisions.

**Q102 Mr Leech:** I was going to come to the question of whether you thought 209 people voting instead of 24 would make any difference. The question I put to Greg was: would it not just cost more money to buy the World Cup?

**Jonathan Calvert:** As it stands at the moment, yes. I agree. The problem is that you have Sepp Blatter at the top, who has presided over the culture of corruption and, in effect, has allowed it to thrive. Until you get new leadership who genuinely want to clean FIFA up, you are not going to have much change.

**Q103 Mr Leech:** I come back to my previous question: other than making people openly vote, so that people know how they voted and can question why they voted a certain way, what other changes need to be in place to make the system clean? Can it be clean?

**Heidi Blake:** I think that FIFA's inability to investigate itself is the core of problem, because FIFA's rules are actually fairly clear. It is against the rules for FIFA executives to accept cash or monetary gifts. It was against the rules for any associate of the Qatar bid, such as Mohamed bin Hammam, to make payments to any FIFA official whatever, which goes right down through the member associations to local club level. Any payment to any of those people would be against the rules. We demonstrated that those rules were broken, but FIFA just ignores its own rules when it does not suit it to investigate.

**Paul Farrelly:** Rather like the editors' code of practice.

**Q104 Mr Leech:** Is there an argument for having no contact between the decision makers and the actual people who are putting in a bid? All of the decision-making process would involve a paper exercise and going to visit places, where those involved did not actually meet anyone involved in the bid.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Actually, yes. A more formalised visit system would work, because they flew the voters over first class, put them up in Doha, got them to meet the Emir and lavished them with hospitality. Within that relationship, anything could happen, so if it was more formalised and all 24 voters go to each bidding city and listen to a formalised pitch, that would certainly help.

**Q105 Jim Sheridan:** First of all, can I echo the comments of the Chair? This has been excellent investigative journalism. You have certainly done your profession a lot of good.

**Heidi Blake:** Thank you.

**Jim Sheridan:** Mention was made earlier about the Committee's trip to Germany some years ago. We were told then by people in the know that England's bid had absolutely no chance of winning, which suggested that that was widespread knowledge. That came from senior people in the German football authorities. Is that the case?

**Jonathan Calvert:** When we were doing our first investigation into this, I met a man called Ahongalu Fusimalohi, who was a former exco member—one of the 24 voters. Something like four or five months before the actual vote, he said quite plainly that England would not win because they just did not do the deals and that they had to do the deals, which meant that they had to pay this person, give this football academy to somebody else and ensure that the people who were voting for them got something out of it. England just did not do that.

**Q106 Jim Sheridan:** I take it that, as part of your investigation, you have investigated the home countries to ensure that our nest is clean.

**Jonathan Calvert:** That the English FA did not do it?

**Jim Sheridan:** No, the home countries—England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. I take it that part of your investigation has been to look at them to ensure that they are not involved in any of this alleged corruption.

**Jonathan Calvert:** I am not aware of any of that. If we were aware of it, we certainly would have reported it.

**Heidi Blake:** Obviously, we have to work with the information that is available to us. Our current cache of information all relates to the Qatar bid, because a whistleblower approached us with that information due to concerns about that particular bid. If anyone wanted to come forward and talk to us about corruption in the English FA, we would certainly be glad to speak to them.

**Q107 Jim Sheridan:** Mention was also made earlier about the role of UEFA. I read the report about Platini and Beckenbauer. When Platini first came to UEFA, he was like the new Obama. He was going to clean things up and would not be corrupted, but it now seems as though he has been wined and dined like the rest of them. You heard Greg Dyke saying that he voted for the Qatar bid for footballing reasons, but how someone of Platini's experience can justify doing that for footballing reasons is beyond me. What can UEFA do to influence FIFA other than walking away and spitting the dummy out of the pram, so to speak?

**Jonathan Calvert:** It is difficult. UEFA needs to find a viable candidate to stand against Sepp Blatter, which is a problem that has been perplexing quite a lot of people. Is Michel Platini the right person? He voted for Qatar and has talked about how he was asked to do so by

Sarkozy, who was President at the time, but has said that he was not influenced by that. As you say, however, how could he, as a footballer, have voted for that bid?

**Q108 Jim Sheridan:** The other thing is that no matter where you go in the world people want to watch English Premier League football. Do you think that the English FA is punching above its weight? If it is, is that why it is so unpopular?

**Jonathan Calvert:** I think it is almost the opposite. The English FA is regarded as arrogant because it is called the Football Association, rather than the English Football Association. The people who run FIFA know full well that the English FA does not have much of a voice.

**Q109 Jim Sheridan:** Finally, given all the information that you have in your investigation, has any interest been shown or given by the national police or the international police? This is blatant corruption. I do not believe that FIFA is above the law in any sense. Has there been any interest from police forces?

**Heidi Blake:** FIFA has a \$20 million sponsorship with the international police, Interpol. We asked them about how they felt about taking \$20 million for an organisation mired in corruption allegations, and they gave us quite short shrift. At national police level, we personally have not had any contact.

**Jonathan Calvert:** No. I suppose it depends on which jurisdiction the actual offence took place in. In Switzerland, it seems that bribery is okay.

**Q110 Jim Sheridan:** Given the evidence—you have been accused of being racist and so on—has anyone from Blatter’s office been in touch with you?

**Jonathan Calvert:** No. We have had no contact whatever. Each week—we did four weeks of articles—we dutifully went through the process of sending all the allegations to them and inviting them to comment on them. We just got bizarre responses from their press office, saying that they cannot be bothered to go through all this.

**Heidi Blake:** The responses became increasingly sublime as we went through the process. They began by ignoring us and ended by saying, “We cannot comment on every piece of paper that you pick out of

your documents. This is ridiculous. This could go on week after week." We kept thinking, "Yes, it could."

**Jonathan Calvert:** They didn't actually comment on one.

**Heidi Blake:** No, neither has the Qatar bid. FIFA and the Qatar bid have entirely stonewalled this. They have not responded to any of the allegations raised. They have come out with blanket statements and have just stonewalled, and they have been allowed to do that.

**Q111 Paul Farrelly:** You heard my questions to Greg about Switzerland and the implication—more than an implication—from what he reported, that Bin Hammam, with his lawyers, took the precaution of checking out whether what he was doing might be illegal in Switzerland. From your knowledge, what is the legal situation on bribery and corruption in Switzerland?

**Heidi Blake:** The document you are referring to is quite extraordinary. It was written by a Swiss lawyer for Mohamed Bin Hammam. The lawyer was instructed by the Qatar bid committee to work with Bin Hammam to produce that document. Obviously, they have no links, is what they claim, but this is yet another one of them. The document advises that because of how FIFA is incorporated as a non-profit organisation in Switzerland and because there is no instrument for prosecuting corrupt payments in Swiss law, candidates in a FIFA presidential election would effectively have immunity from prosecution over the payment of bribes. The lawyer in question said that the reason why he had been asked to provide that advice was that Mohamed Bin Hammam was worried that Sepp Blatter was going to make bribe payments, and he wanted to know whether he had any recourse in law if that was the case. Obviously, what we went on to see was that Mohamed Bin Hammam himself went on to make corrupt payments throughout his campaign. It would certainly appear, however, that that is the legal position, which is quite extraordinary.

**Q112 Paul Farrelly:** If that were the legal position in the UK, whether the revelations come from a UK newspaper or an overseas one, you would expect in the UK for there to be a clamour in the press, Parliament and parts of Government for the law to be changed. Has there been any clamour at all in any part of Swiss Government or society to say, "We must act."?

**Jonathan Calvert:** Not that I am aware of.

**Heidi Blake:** That is sort of their USP, isn't it? That is why people go there. No, not remotely.

**Q113 Paul Farrelly:** Nothing at all?

**Heidi Blake:** No. But it is extraordinary. It is part of the reason why FIFA is so impervious—it is not accountable, and it is not accountable under the law for this sort of reason. Because it is the regulator of world football, there is no higher authority that it is answerable to, so it can just bat off these allegations. The only people who can hold FIFA to account are its member associations, which is why it is disappointing to hear Greg Dyke say that they feel powerless and that there is not much point in walking away, and why it is disappointing that UEFA does not feel that it can do that either. If the member associations got together and made a stand and said, "We are not going to take this," FIFA would crumble.

**Q114 Paul Farrelly:** When is Sepp Blatter due for election?

**Heidi Blake:** Next year.

**Jonathan Calvert:** It's May or June next year.

**Paul Farrelly:** I'm just thinking of your calendar going forward. Presumably, this will be a key date in your forward diary. Were he to stand, there might be even worse revelations that would be even worse for football, and therefore, for the good of football, he should not stand.

**Heidi Blake:** Certainly, in our evidence so far, we have seen and heard some evidence that gives us cause for concern about the role of Sepp Blatter and his relationship with Qatar. It is not something we can publicise at this point, but we will continue to work on that, and it does give us very grave concerns. There are questions about his relationship with Qatar, and he is the person who is going to decide whether Michael Garcia's report should be published or not.

**Paul Farrelly:** But if you have evidence, you will publish and you will be damned.

**Heidi Blake:** We will publish if we can reach the standard of evidence that we would want to meet before we published in the newspaper. We are certainly still investigating. FIFA is not capable of investigating itself properly, but we will continue to do so.

**Q115 Chair:** In the past, when we have examined this, you have supplied us with information. Is there anything you would like to say to us or give to us under privilege?

**Heidi Blake:** Not at this stage, but there may be an occasion in the future. If you would be happy to receive evidence from us in future, we will be happy to submit it.

**Chair:** Okay. I have one question on something different.

**Q116 Paul Farrelly:** I have one curiosity question. You have answered the catch-all one that John's asked you. Qatar got 11 votes in the first round and 10 in the second. That looks like someone wanting to be able to say, "I voted for you," having promised his or her vote. Who was that? Do you know? Or do you have a best guess?

**Heidi Blake:** It would have to be a guess, but it certainly looks suspicious.

**Paul Farrelly:** Give us your best guess.

**Heidi Blake:** Are we in the business of giving guesses?

**Paul Farrelly:** Who was playing both ends of the fiddle?

**Jonathan Calvert:** It could be anyone. There are so many who are sort of double dealing and moving between votes. Of course, they got 14 in the end.

**Paul Farrelly:** That's not an answer, Jonathan. Heidi's got a best guess.

**Heidi Blake:** I don't think it is wise to guess about these things, but we will publish further information later in the year. If we can bottom that out, we will get back to you.

**Jim Sheridan:** You can pass the buck if you want.

**Q117 Chair:** May I ask something completely different as a final question? You are both very experienced investigative journalists. Do you have any thoughts or observations on the dismissal of the case against Tulisa?

**Jonathan Calvert:** I must admit, I am not completely up with it.

**Chair:** Do you think it has set back investigative journalism in terms of undercover operations of the kind that was mounted against her, or was it just so deeply flawed that it was never going to stand up and it does not affect the kind of investigations that you do?

**Heidi Blake:** I think there is a different burden of proof, obviously, in a criminal court than there is in a libel court. Trying to prosecute a case based on evidence gathered by journalists and not evidence gathered by police is always going to be difficult. But, beyond that, I don't think it is something that will affect us. It is a different sort of work from the work that we do.

**Q118 Chair:** It is not entirely. The Tulisa case is based on somebody pretending to be somebody he was not in accumulating evidence, which is roughly what you have done in very different circumstances, but it is the same kind of tactic.

**Heidi Blake:** Yes, it is; that's true. Obviously, we have to have our own professional standards about the way that we operate.

**Q119 Chair:** Are you going to read the judgment?

**Jonathan Calvert:** The problem I have is that, having been preparing for this yesterday, I have not actually read the story. Was it thrown out by the jury? Was it thrown out by the judge?

**Chair:** By the judge.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Right.

**Heidi Blake:** I am certain that our lawyers will supply us with a copy of the judgment. I am sure we will have some bedtime reading.

**Q120 Paul Farrelly:** Clearly, you have a more substantial public interest defence—or not defence—in what you investigate, compared with what the "Fake Sheikh" investigates.

**Heidi Blake:** You could argue that. Obviously, if Mazher Mahmood is investigating potential criminality then he would of course have a public interest defence in doing that. We do tend to investigate different subject areas and public interest is always front and centre in what we investigate. That is really important to us.

**Q121 Jim Sheridan:** May I just ask about the FIFA thing? I am hung up on this Interpol \$20 million. Where does Interpol get \$20 million?

**Heidi Blake:** FIFA pays Interpol. I think it is over the course of a period of years, but I can't remember exactly what period. It is public information. They pay \$20 million in exchange for training and advisory services provided by Interpol.

**Q122 Jim Sheridan:** If you take it down to brass tacks, there is only one source that goes into football and that is from the fans, whether by merchandise, tickets or whatever. That is the only source of income. Yet we cannot get the police to investigate people who are misusing their money. I find that incredible.

**Heidi Blake:** It is indeed incredible.

**Jim Sheridan:** The police are standing by watching this and doing nothing about it.

**Q123 Tracey Crouch:** I had something I wanted to ask. You have spent a long time looking into this and delved into a very dark murky business where it is quite clear there has been corruption in a multi-billion pound industry that means a lot to a lot of people. Have you ever been concerned about your own personal welfare and safety?

**Heidi Blake:** It's best not to dwell on that.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Often, our friends talk to us about that, but you never feel that. You feel disconnected from it.

**Heidi Blake:** We have never been given any cause, certainly from anyone at FIFA, to feel any concern about that.

**Paul Farrelly:** Chair, is this being televised?

**Chair:** Yes, I believe so.

**Q124 Paul Farrelly:** The "Fake Sheikh" appeared behind a screen, as I understand, in court. It is not good for your undercover activities, Heidi, because your face is now very well known.

**Heidi Blake:** This is true, although—

**Chair:** I think you had appeared on television before.

**Heidi Blake:** Yes, it is not the first time. There are always wigs.

**Chair:** May I thank both of you very much for coming? If at a future date you wish to supply further evidence to the Committee, we would be interested to see it.

**Heidi Blake:** Thank you very much.

**Jonathan Calvert:** Thank you.

