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Introduction

This research project, which has been delivered by the Centre for Access to Football in Europe and funded by the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport, Council of Europe, reviewed the existing ticketing management systems and associated ‘proof of disability’ for disabled sports fans who require special seating and/or complimentary companion (personal assistant) tickets for large sporting events.

The aim of the project was to find a sustainable and more convenient solution which ensures the dignity and respect of disabled people themselves whilst ensuring that tickets are best allocated to genuine disabled spectators by large sporting event owners/local organising committees. The aim is to reduce the number of tickets that are currently miss-sold to non-disabled persons.

Representatives of sports governing bodies (event owners/hosts) and European disabled persons/spectators and disability groups played a critical part in the research analysis and in determining the outcomes and best practice guidelines for the future for large sporting event owners.

Methodology

Through our own experiences and those of European disabled football spectators, we realised that there was an issue regarding ‘proof of disability’ requirements. We spoke with large sports event owners and gauged the opinions of a range of European disabled spectators, and then applied to the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS), Council of Europe, to fund a small research project.

With €10,000 funding secured, we appointed the German Sport University Cologne to act as an independent research partner in the project to undertake a scientific study. We then formed a representative working group of large sporting event owners (see Appendix I) to provide detailed information on the key issues in distributing disabled spectator tickets. In addition, a disabled spectators advisory group was established to enable CAFE to convey a wide range of the experiences and challenges faced in purchasing tickets to our research partners. The disabled spectator survey was disseminated as widely as possible. It was published in six languages – English, French, German, Polish, Russian and Spanish with access support provided to individual participants as required. CAFE used various means of circulation such as electronic newsletters, social media, and international stakeholder websites including CAFE’s partners and non-governmental disability and equality organisations from across Europe.

Research survey findings

Ticketing

Top event ticket owners stated that there is a large demand throughout the market for disabled people's tickets. Often, they are even oversubscribed. If the ticket owner requests 'proof of disability', there is regularly a very high dropout from initial application.
Most disabled spectators stated that there are not enough tickets available at away games in their own country. For games in other countries, only 9.7% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that there are enough tickets available for disabled spectators.

**Abuse**

Ticket owners stated that there is sometimes a delay in distributing tickets to genuine disabled spectators because of the risk of abuse. This leads to an expiration of tickets which are highly requested by disabled people. Overall, some ticket owners stated that the risk of abuse is extremely high.

Most disabled people agreed that there is generally a delay in the selling and allocation of tickets for disabled spectators (in comparison to non-disabled spectator tickets). Nearly half of disabled people who participated in the survey thought that there is a problem with the mis-selling of disabled spectator tickets. Of the participants who believed that there is mis-selling, most would say that tickets for disabled people are misused by other people quite frequently (but only few would say that they witness misuse frequently). Of the participants who thought there is mis-selling, most felt that abuse is moderate with no extremes at one end.

**Possible arrangements of seeking 'proof of disability'**

Ticket owners feel a delicacy about seeking 'proof of disability' on site. They are worried about violation of human dignity. There are a range of people (requiring disabled spectator tickets), but they might not all want to be classified as 'disabled'. Emotional aspects might be pivotal. A range of people might also fear that ticket owners hold sensitive and very personal data about their 'disability'. Added together ticket owners do face challenges especially at international sporting events – where it would be almost impossible to validate applications for disabled spectator and companion tickets.

Some ticket owners may consider further 'proof of disability' systems in order to solve existing issues. But, they are worried that for disabled spectators who (like to) visit sporting events, a more rigid 'proof of disability' system could bring some disadvantages: A more rigid 'proof of disability' could be understood as a restraint of human dignity. Some people might not wish to share information with other persons about their 'disability'.

Otherwise, for disabled spectators who (like to) visit sporting events, a more rigid 'proof of disability' could bring some advantages: A standardisation of 'proof of disability' might simplify the verification procedures and therefore assist everyday life situations. More simplified verification procedures could optimise the on-time ticket allocation for disabled spectators and their attendance at sporting events. A big advantage might be the opportunity to reduce abuse of tickets for disabled people drastically. Less abuse could lead to more social equity: This might be observed by a more acceptable system of allocating tickets for accessible seats for disabled people and their friends and families.

Generally one must consider that the number of disabled people visiting sporting events is growing rapidly. Therefore more 'proof of disability' will become necessary. One possibility could be the introduction of a European wide 'Disabled Persons ID Card'.
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The participants more often agreed that the 'proof of disability' is treated in different ways by different sporting event owners. Disabled persons agreed that a standardised system could reduce abuse. Nearly all participants agreed there should be a standardised system in place when requesting disabled spectators tickets.

Although many participants disagreed when asked if they felt discriminated against by having to provide their 'proof of disability', almost thirty percent of participants said that they would feel discriminated against. Two third of the participants disagreed that the purchase of (disabled spectator) tickets should be based on trust. Nearly all participants agreed there should be a standardised system in place when requesting disabled spectators tickets. A standardised 'proof of disability' for their own and other countries found agreement most often.

Most participants agreed that a standardised European ID card could solve the current problem of misuse. More than half would like governmental entities to be the custodians. Nearly all participants would welcome a European wide standardised ID card that would also be valid for other sporting and cultural events. Almost 60% of the participants said that they would not feel discriminated against if the European ID card also included details such as 'disability' categories.

**General conditions**

 Disabled people stated that they often get their tickets at reduced costs / concessionary prices. However, more than two thirds of the participants would prefer equal facilities to cheaper tickets. 73% of wheelchair users and 80% of people with mental ill health would prefer equal facilities rather than cheaper tickets.

**Independent research partner recommendations (Sports Institute of Cologne)**

1. There should be a review of the management of ticketing for disabled spectators from abroad. A policy of transparency and better communication strategies on the policies could help.

2. There seems to be a significant amount of abuse concerning tickets for disabled persons. The aim should be to reduce this abuse and find more effective systems for the future that assist large sporting event owners whilst preventing any requirements from becoming too onerous for disabled spectators.

3. A containment of abuse could help to optimise the ticketing allocations for disabled spectators. Most disabled spectators would be happy to follow such arrangements.

4. The development and introduction of a standardised system of 'proof of disability' could help to optimise the ticketing for disabled spectators. Most disabled people would be prepared to follow such arrangements.
5. There should be a standardised system which helps on an international level.

6. To minimise issues concerning the holding of sensitive data, it could help to appoint governmental entities as the custodians.

7. The specific data held on a possible European Disabled Persons ID Card should be carefully managed.

8. Ticket owners and their host venues should think about providing better facilities. Reduced concessionary prices can not be a substitute for providing an accessible and inclusive sporting venue.
Conclusion

Disabled sports spectators are increasingly reporting a number of issues around inconsistency with regard to ‘proof of disability’ requirements by the owners of sporting events, both on home soil and at international events. They consider that there is an issue with abuse and misuse of ticketing.

With the research study having reached out to around 700 European pan-disabled spectators, it seems clear that the majority would very much prefer a unified system along the lines of a European Disability ID card. Rather than seeing such a system as an infringement of their human rights, the majority would regard such a card to be advantageous to their daily lives in attending live sporting and cultural events. The majority of disabled people who completed the survey believe that the right way forward is through the implementation of a European Disability ID card that would be managed by Governmental entities.

Please see Appendix II for the full ‘scientific report’ (Accessible formats are available on request).
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A. Research Overview

Research objective

The aim of the project is to find a sustainable solution to the management of disabled ticketing by organisations and sporting event owners, which ensures the dignity of disabled people whilst ensuring that tickets for disabled spectators and their companions or personal assistants are appropriately allocated to disabled spectators by large sporting event owners/Local Organising Committees. The aim of the project is to reduce the number of tickets that are currently mis-sold to non-disabled persons.
Research method

To master this research aim the project works with a spectrum of methods belonging to the field of social science.

The qualitative analyses work with in-depth interviews. The quantitative analyses work with standardised questionnaires.

Research method

1. Expert discussion with ticket owner working group across a range of international sports events
2. Questionnaire to European disabled sports fans
Research method

The implemented in-depth interviews pursue the aim to achieve an adequate appraisal about the research object. Specific conversation techniques help to filter the most important issues. These issues are transferred into a catalogue of questions, which are addressed to disabled sports spectators across Europe.

B. Expert discussion with ticket owner working group
Discussants/Participants

(Tuesday 18th June 2013, 11:00-14:30; Centre for Access to Football in Europe; Regus House, Chester Business Park, Chester, United Kingdom)

- Joyce Cook – Managing Director, CAFE
- Sarah Williams – Equality Manager at Rugby Football League (Rugby League World Cup 2013)
- Harpreet Grewal – Head of Customer Services and England fans at the Football Association
- Rainer Berak – Senior Ticketing & Hospitality Solutions Manager, UEFA EURO 2012
- Mike Rice – Projects and Fan Liaison Manager, CAFE
- Dr. Christoph Bertling – Institute for Communication and Media Research, German Sport University Cologne

Brief Summary

The ticket owners highlighted the following issues and challenges concerning ticketing allocations for large sporting events (eg. UEFA EURO 2012, Rugby League World Cup):
• Ticket owners explained that they are seeking to ensure that disabled spectators tickets, plus companion or personal assistant tickets, are correctly allocated.
• It is not possible for large event owners to identify genuine requests for disabled spectators so they often seek 'proof of disability'. However, this proof varies from country to country and in some cases the regions in each country.
• There have also been a number of incidents reported whereby non-disabled people have obtained or tried to obtain disabled spectators tickets (note that companion/personal assistant tickets are provided free of charge).

This appraisal is based on the following observations:

• There is an increasingly large demand for tickets for sports events for disabled people. Demand often outweighs supply.
• The request from ticket owners for 'proof of disability' regularly sees a very high dropout which may be up to 90 percent.
• Seeking 'proof of disability' may also cause temporal delays to allocating disabled spectators tickets, which can in turn lead to difficulties in securing accommodation and travel for disabled people as this is normally in high demand.

• Nonetheless ticket owners feel a delicacy about a 'proof of disability' at the sporting event. They fear to violate human dignity.

• Summarising there is a possibility of abuse and additional barriers for disabled people.
• Added together ticket owners do face challenges – especially at larger international sporting events – in managing ticket allocations for disabled spectators and companions.

• Documents to show ‘proof disability’ vary significantly from country to country. They are very country-specific. Uniformity (even concerning simple categories such as language, agency, authorities) is not given.

For example in Ukraine there are even different (country-specific) regional documents for ‘proof of disability’.

Some ticket owners are even considering additional systems in order to try to manage existing issues.
For disabled spectators who (like to) visit sport events, any more rigid 'proof of disability' system could bring some disadvantages.

Any more rigid 'proof of disability' could be understood as a restraint of human dignity. Some people might not be willing to provide information about their 'disability' to other persons.
• A range of disabled people might also fear that ticket owners would store sensitive, personal data about their ‘disability’.

Alternatively, seeking ‘proof of disability’ from disabled spectators who like to visit sport events could bring some advantages:
A standardisation of 'proof of disability' might simplify the verification procedures and therefore everyday life situations.

More simplified verification procedures could optimise the earlier allocation of tickets for disabled spectators and assist them in making travel and accommodation arrangements prior to visiting sporting events.

Another advantage might be the opportunity to reduce any abuse of disabled spectators tickets.
A more straightforward system of disabled spectator and companion tickets could lead to more social equity. This might have benefits for both disabled people and the sports event owners.

Generally, one must consider that the amount of disabled people visiting sporting events is growing rapidly. Therefore it may be concluded that an increase in requests for 'proof of disability' would be necessary.
An online-questioning of disabled spectators, who visit sporting events, should give information about the necessity of a proof of disability and which forms are possible.

One possibility could be an European-wide 'Disabled Persons ID Card'.
This leads to the pivotal research questions:

What is the best possibility to improve the ticketing systems for disabled spectators?

In what way might a 'proof of disability' help to improve the situation for ticket owners as well as for disabled people?

In order to answer these points one questionnaire was designed for disabled spectators in Europe. The following subject areas were included.
I. Ticketing

II. Possible Abuse/Ticketing

III. 'Proof of Disability’/Ticketing

IV. Possible Arrangements of validating ticket holders at the event

V. Social Demographics

Following subject areas were prompted by a standardised questionnaire:
I. Ticketing

This category contains questions concerned with the current common management concerning disabled spectators ticketing.

II. Possible Abuse/Ticketing

This category contains questions concerned with possible abuse of tickets for disabled people and their companion.

The aim is to find out to what extent abuse occurs/is observed or perceived to occur.
I. 'Proof of Disability'/Ticketing

This category contains questions concerned with current practices for seeking 'proof of disability'.

II. IV. Possible Arrangements of validating ticket holders at the event

This category contains questions concerned with possible further arrangements of 'proof of disability' which could be most helpful.
V. Social Demographics

This category contains questions concerned with social demographics to ensure a good cross section of disabled people in the survey.

C. Survey

- Online survey of disabled spectators in Europe
- Languages of the questionnaires
  - English
  - French
  - German
  - Polish
  - Russian
  - Spanish
- Duration of investigation: Sept. 4th - Oct. 7th 2013
Overview: Participants

- A total of 696 participants with a range of 'disabilities'
- Nearly 80% are male, 85% are white and 83% are heterosexual
- Most participants visit football matches
- Almost half the participants live in the United Kingdom, another 19% are from Poland, 13% from the Ukraine and nearly 10% from Germany
- On average the participants are 42 years old

Participants in questionnaire versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Brutto</th>
<th>Netto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The brutto number is the total number of participants who opened the survey and started it. Some of them shut the window during the survey and some finished it. The number of persons who finished the survey to the last page is the netto number. Participants dropped out at different stages. There are also questions that were left out on a page and the participant continued the survey. So nearly every question has a different number of participants. This is quite normal since not every participant would like to answer every question for different reasons.
Key Results

I. Sport and frequency of visits at the stadium
II. Disabled ticketing in general
III. Abuse or perceived abuse of tickets
IV. Experiences with 'proof of disability'
   - Home country
   - Other countries
V. Opinions on 'proof of disability' in general
VI. Opinions on standardised 'proof of disability'
VII. Equality monitoring

I. Sport and frequency of visits at the stadium
Most participants attend football matches

- Football: 84%
- Other: 6%
- Basketball: 3%
- Rugby: 2%
- Handball: 1%
- Cricket: 1%
- Athletics: 2%
- Volleyball: 1%

4. Which sport do you most often attend? n=435

Nearly half of the participants are regulars at games...

5. Approximately how many times a year do you attend sporting events in your country? n=441
Visits at games in their own countries divided by 'disability group'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Less than 1/ year</th>
<th>1-5/ year</th>
<th>6-12/ year</th>
<th>11-15/ year</th>
<th>16-20/ year</th>
<th>More than 20/ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted (n=32)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing (n=16)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled (n=92)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user (n=180)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually disabled (n=12)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health (n=5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition (n=35)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Approximately how many times a year do you attend sporting events in your country? Divided by disability group.

... and visit home games as well as away games in their countries

- Home events/matches: Yes 91%, No 9%
- Away events/matches: Yes 64%, No 36%
Visits at home games and away games in their countries by 'disability group'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted n=22</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing n=10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled n=82</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user n=180</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually disabled n=12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health n=5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition n=15</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the participants do not visit matches in other countries very often

- 58% do not attend matches at all
- 20% attend less than once a year
- 18% attend between 1-5 times a year
- 2% attend 6-10 times a year
- 2% attend 11-15 times a year
- 2% attend 16-20 times a year
- 2% attend more than 20 times a year

6. Approximately how many times a year do you attend sporting events in another country? n=439

46
### Visits at games in other countries divided by 'disability group'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Less than 1/ year</th>
<th>1-5/ year</th>
<th>6-12/ year</th>
<th>11-15/ year</th>
<th>16-20/ year</th>
<th>More than 20/ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually disabled</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Approximately how many times a year do you attend sporting events in another country? Divided by disability group

### Sports and frequencies

There seems to be a fairly strong involvement in watching sport, mainly in football. Many disabled spectators visit events more than 20 times a year, home games as well as away games. Although only smaller percentages visit games in other countries regularly, more than 40 percent say they go to other countries to visit events.
II. Disabled ticketing in general

Almost half of the participants felt that there are not enough tickets available for disabled spectators at home games. An even higher number of participants felt that there were not enough tickets available for disabled spectators at away matches in their own country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home games (n=348)</th>
<th>Away games in own country (n=339)</th>
<th>Away games in other countries (n=331)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither/hesitant</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Would you say that there are enough tickets available to disabled spectators?
The opinion of participants who visit away games slightly differs. They mostly felt that there are not enough tickets available at away games.

The opinion of participants who visit games in other countries is even stronger. Half of the participants who visit games in other countries felt that there are not enough tickets available.
Concerning the sufficiency of the timeframe in which tickets are bought, most participants were season ticket holders.

![Bar chart showing percentages of participants who feel they have sufficient time to buy tickets, with 35% being season ticket holders.]

8. Do you feel that you are given sufficient time to buy tickets to sport events? n=365

More participants agree that there is generally a delay in the selling and allocation of tickets for disabled spectators.

![Bar chart showing percentages of participants who agree with a delay, with 32% agreeing and 6% strongly disagreeing.]

9. Is there generally a delay in the selling and allocation of tickets for disabled spectators? n=360
Often the participants buy their tickets at reduced costs/concessionary prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>at no time</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>now and again</th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>very frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted n=21</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9,5%</td>
<td>26,6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing n=15</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
<td>37,5%</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
<td>31,3%</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled n=52</td>
<td>9,7%</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
<td>16,1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user n=178</td>
<td>6,7%</td>
<td>7,3%</td>
<td>16,3%</td>
<td>32,6%</td>
<td>30,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually disabled n=12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health n=5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition n=35</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25,7%</td>
<td>34,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you usually obtain your disabled spectator tickets at reduced costs/concessionary prices? n=386

Most spectators with hidden disabilities are less likely to get tickets at reduced prices.
More than two thirds of survey participants would prefer equal facilities to cheaper tickets

There are differences in preferring equal facilities to cheaper tickets and the 'disability group'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cheaper tickets</th>
<th>Equal facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted n=22</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing n=15</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled n=61</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user n=178</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually disabled n=12</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health n=5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition n=34</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ticketing in general

Almost half of the participants felt that there are not enough tickets available for disabled spectators at home games. An even higher number felt that insufficient numbers were available for away games in their own country.

Many participants often get tickets at reduced prices. However, the majority would prefer equal facilities.

III. Abuse or perceived abuse of disabled spectators tickets
Nearly half of the participants think that there is a problem with the mis-selling of disabled spectator tickets.

10. In your opinion, do you believe there to be a problem with the mis-selling of disabled spectator tickets to non-disabled spectators. N=592.

Of the participants who believe that there is mis-selling...
... most would say that tickets for disabled people are misused by other people quite often...

![Pie chart showing 24% and 76%]

11. Would you say that tickets for disabled spectators and companions / personal assistants are being misused by other people? n=181, m=mis-selling yes

... but less would say they witness misuse often

![Pie chart showing 58% and 42%]

12. Do you believe that you have witnessed tickets for disabled spectators being raced over to other (non-disabled) spectators? n=151, m=mis-selling yes
If participants were sure of misuse, the majority would be offended

- Yes: 93%
- No: 7%

13. Would you be offended if you witnessed or were made aware of mis-sold spectators tickets being used by unauthorised persons? n=107 mis-selling: yes

Of the participants who think there is mis-selling most think that there is abuse

14. In your opinion, how much abuse do you believe there to be around disabled spectators tickets? n=119 mis-selling: yes

- No abuse: 4%
- Little abuse: 20%
- Some abuse: 41%
- Moderate abuse: 22%
- Large abuse: 13%
Abuse or perceived abuse

Nearly half of the participants think that there is mis-selling of tickets. Of those who think there is mis-selling three quarters think that abuse happens quite often. However, abuse is not witnessed that often.

IV. Experiences with 'proof of disability'

Home country
Most participants have to usually show their 'proof of disability' to qualify for a disabled spectator ticket

At the home club the 'proof of disability' has to be shown less often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Own Club (n=224)</th>
<th>Away Club (n=183)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a year/season</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every time of purchase</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues with 'proof of disability'

Nearly two thirds of the participants say that there is a lack of consistency between seeking 'proof of disability' at sports and stadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues understanding type of 'proof of disability' required (n=288)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't understand which documents (n=283)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency between sports and stadia (n=303)</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment to having to provide proof more than once/year (n=293)</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Thinking about when you have been asked to provide your proof of disability to obtain disabled spectator tickets (and a companion / personal assistant ticket), please consider the following statements and what best describes your personal experiences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Now and again</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems transmitting documents (n=303)</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof is not accepted (n=285)</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Thinking about when you have been asked to provide your proof of disability to obtain disabled spectator tickets (and a companion / personal assistant ticket), please consider the following statements and what best describes your personal experiences?
47% of participants agree that the current ‘proof of disability’ in their own country is **not** a practical one.

![Bar chart showing responses to the question: Is the current system for providing all proof of disability in your own country a practical one?](chart.png)

20. Is the current system for providing all proof of disability in your own country a practical one? n=331

---

**IV. Experiences with ‘proof of disability’**

**Other countries**
In other countries, most participants do not have to show their 'proof of disability'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At no time</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now and again</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequently</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not attend</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Do you have to show a proof of disability at events in other countries? n=298

Participants reported only a few problems with existing 'proof of disability' systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>At no time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Now and again</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in understanding</td>
<td>63,1 %</td>
<td>15,8 %</td>
<td>12,6 %</td>
<td>3,6 %</td>
<td>5,0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not understand which documents</td>
<td>60,8 %</td>
<td>15,7 %</td>
<td>12,9 %</td>
<td>5,5 %</td>
<td>5,1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof is not accepted</td>
<td>71,0 %</td>
<td>15,2 %</td>
<td>6,9 %</td>
<td>2,8 %</td>
<td>4,1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems transmitting the documents</td>
<td>58,3 %</td>
<td>15,6 %</td>
<td>14,2 %</td>
<td>6,9 %</td>
<td>5,0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Have you experienced any of the following when considering a request for a 'proof of disability'?
In other countries participants more often say that there is a lack of consistency between sports and stadia in seeking 'proof of disability'. 36.5% resent having to produce 'proof of disability'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resent having to provide proof more than once/year (n=213)</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency between sports and stadia (n=213)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Have you experienced any of the following when considering a request for a proof of disability?

For the 'proof of disability' in other countries participants less often agree that the current system for providing proof is a practical one.
Experiences with 'proof of disability'

Disabled spectators report problems with providing 'proof of disability' although problems do not occur very often. However, a lack of consistency between sports and stadia is seen on a national as well as on an international level. Providing 'proof of disability' for events in other countries seems to be less practical at this moment than in the participant's own country.

V. Opinions on 'proof of disability' in general
The participants more often agree that the 'proof of disability' is treated in different ways by different sporting event owners: 60% agree or strongly agree.

81% of the participants agree that a standardised system could reduce abuse.
Nearly all participants (84%) agree or strongly agree there should be a standardised system in place when requesting disabled spectators tickets.

26. Do you believe that there should be a standardised system in place to manage proof of disability when requesting disabled spectator and their companion / personal assistant tickets? (n=317)

Although many participants disagree when asked if they felt discriminated against by having to provide their 'proof of disability' there is also nearly thirty percent of participants who would agree.

27. Did you feel discriminated against by having to provide 'proof of disability' to qualify for a disabled spectator and companion / personal assistant ticket for sports events you have attended in the past? (n=316)
Only 23% of the participants agree that the purchase of tickets should be based on trust.

Opinion on ‘proof of disability’ in general

Most participants support the idea of a standardised ‘proof of disability’. They agree that it could reduce abuse and that a standardised system should be in place. Only the minority of participants agree that the purchase of tickets should be based on trust.
VI. Opinions on standardised 'proof of disability' 

The introduction of a standardised 'proof of disability' (both home and other countries) gets agreement quite often.

![Graph showing agreement levels](image)

29/03/31. Would you appreciate the introduction of a standardised 'proof of disability' system for sport events?
Most participants (84%) agree that a standardised European ID card could solve the current problem of misuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither/Nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Do you believe that a standardised European 'proof of disability' ID card could solve the current problem of the misuse of disabled spectator tickets by some non-disabled people in Europe? n=202

Most participants (85%) agree that a European ID card would make their life easier when purchasing disabled spectator tickets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither/Nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Do you consider that a standardised European 'proof of disability' ID card would make your life easier when purchasing disabled spectator and companion/personal assistant tickets? n=201
Participants do agree more often that they would be happy to show their proof once a season or year rather than showing it every time.

34/25. Would you be happy to show a proof of disability ID card?

36. Would you feel discriminated against if a ‘proof of disability’ ID card included details such as ‘disability’ categories to help reduce abuse and to optimize organizational issues? n=216

Only 30% of the participants said that they would feel discriminated against if the ID card included details such as ‘disability’ categories.
More than 60% of hard of hearing and deaf participants answered that they would feel discriminated against if the ID card held further details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted n=22</td>
<td>27,3%</td>
<td>40,9%</td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>13,6%</td>
<td>13,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing n=13</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
<td>31,3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled n=82</td>
<td>14,5%</td>
<td>32,3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user n=177</td>
<td>27,1%</td>
<td>30,7%</td>
<td>10,7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,7%</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabled n=12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition n=35</td>
<td>28,6%</td>
<td>31,4%</td>
<td>14,3%</td>
<td>8,6%</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Would you feel discriminated against if a ‘proof of disability’ ID card included further details such as disability categories to help reduce abuse and to optimize organizational issues? Divided by disability group.

Almost 60% would choose governmental entities to be the custodian of the card.

- Sporting event owners: 30%
- Govmm. entities: 59%
- Other: 11%

37. If a ‘proof of disability’ ID card was introduced, in your opinion, which organisation should or could become the custodian? n=311
51% of participants would be content for their details to be held on a sporting event owner’s database.

Nearly all participants (87%) would welcome a European standardised ID card that would be valid for other cultural events as well.
Standardised proof of disability

Most participants support the idea of a standardised 'proof of disability ID card'. They agree that it could reduce abuse and that a standardised system should be in place. Only the minority agrees that the purchase of tickets should be based on trust. Most participants would welcome governmental entities as custodians with ID cards recognised for additional events (including non-sporting cultural events).

VII. Information on participants
### Disabled / for disabled child / on behalf of disabled person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider yourself disabled (n=551)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a disabled child (n=550)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On behalf of a disabled person (n=551)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Disability group'

- No: 12%
- Yes: 88%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind/partially sighted</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/hard of hearing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulant disabled</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair user</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning or intellectually disabled</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ill health</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health condition</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person? 
   b) If yes, do you consider yourself to be...
### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual male</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual female</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differently</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=312 \)

### Religion/belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=307 \)

### D. OVERALL SUMMARY
I. TICKETING/GENERAL SITUATION

Top event ticket owners state that there is a large demand throughout the market for disabled people’s tickets. Often, they are even oversubscribed. If the ticket owner requests 'proof of disability', there is regularly a very high dropout from initial application.

Most disabled spectators state that there are not enough tickets available at away games in their own country. For games in other countries, only 9.7% of participants agree or strongly agree that there are enough tickets available for disabled spectators.
II. ABUSE

Ticket owners state there is a delay in distributing tickets to genuine disabled spectators because of abuse. This leads to an expiration of tickets which are highly requested by disabled people. Overall, some ticket owners state that the risk of abuse is extremely high.
Most disabled people agree that there is generally a delay in the selling and allocation of tickets for disabled spectators. Nearly half of disabled people think that there is a problem with the mis-selling of disabled spectator tickets. Of the participants who believe that there is mis-selling, most would say that tickets for disabled people are misused by other people quite frequently (but only few would say they witness misuse frequently). Of the participants who think there is mis-selling, most think abuse is moderate with no extremes at one end.

III. POSSIBLE ARRANGEMENTS OF SEEKING 'PROOF OF DISABILITY'
Ticket owners feel a delicacy about seeking 'proof of disability' on site. They are worried about violation of human dignity. There are a range of people (requiring disabled spectator tickets), but they might not all want to be classified as 'disabled'. Emotional aspects might be pivotal. A range of people might also fear that ticket owners hold sensitive and very personal data about their 'disability'. Added together ticket owners do face challenges especially at international sporting events — where it would be almost impossible to validate applications for disabled spectator and companion tickets.

Some ticket owners may consider further 'proof of disability' systems in order to solve existing issues. But they are worried that for disabled spectators, who (like to) visit sporting events, a more rigid 'proof of disability' system could bring some disadvantages: A more rigid 'proof of disability' could be understood as a restraint of human dignity. Some people might not wish to share informations with other persons about their 'disability'.

Otherwise, for disabled spectators who (like to) visit sporting events, a more rigid 'proof of disability' could bring some advantages. A standardisation of 'proof of disability' might simplify the verification procedures and therefore assist everyday life situations. More simplified verification procedures could optimise the on-time ticket allocation for disabled spectators and their attendance at sporting events. A big advantage might be the opportunity to reduce abuse of tickets for disabled people drastically. Less abuse could lead to more social equity: This might be observed by a more acceptable system of allocating tickets for accessible seats for disabled people and their friends and families.

Generally one must consider that the number of disabled people visiting sporting events is growing rapidly. Therefore more 'proof of disability' will become necessary. One possibility could be the introduction of a European wide 'Disabled Persons ID Card'.
The participants more often agree that the 'proof of disability' is treated in different ways by different sporting event owners. Disabled persons agree that a standardised system could reduce abuse. Nearly all participants agree there should be a standardised system in place when requesting disabled spectators' tickets.

Although many participants disagree when asked if they felt discriminated against by having to provide their 'proof of disability', there is also nearly thirty percent of participants who would feel discriminated against. Two thirds of the participants disagree that the purchase of tickets should be based on trust. Nearly all participants agree there should be a standardised system in place when requesting disabled spectators' tickets. A standardised 'proof of disability' for their own and other countries gets agreement most often.
Most participants agree that a standardised European ID card could solve the current problem of misuse. More than half would like governmental entities to be the custodian. Nearly all participants would welcome a European standardised ID card that would also be valid for other cultural events. Almost 60% of the participants said that they would not feel discriminated against if the European ID card included details such as ‘disability’ categories.

IV. GENERAL CONDITIONS
Disabled people state that they often get their tickets at reduced costs / concessionary prices. More than two thirds of the participants would prefer equal facilities to cheaper tickets. 73% of wheelchair users and 80% of people with mental ill health would prefer equal facilities rather than cheaper tickets.

E. MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
1. There should be a review of the management of ticketing for disabled spectators from abroad. A policy of transparency and better communication strategies on the policies could help.

2. There seems to be a significant amount of abuse concerning tickets for disabled persons. The aim should be to reduce this abuse and find more effective systems for the future that assist large sporting event owners whilst preventing any requirements from becoming too onerous for disabled spectators.

3. A containment of abuse could help to optimise the ticketing allocations for disabled spectators. Most disabled spectators would be happy to follow such arrangements.

4. The development and introduction of a standardised system of ‘proof of disability’ could help to optimise the ticketing for disabled spectators. Most disabled people would be prepared to follow such arrangements.
5. There should be a standardised system which helps on an international level.

6. To minimise issues concerning the holding of sensitive data, it could help to appoint governmental entities as the custodians.

7. The specific data held on a possible European Disabled Persons ID Card should be carefully managed.

8. Ticket owners and their host venues should think about providing better facilities. Reduced concessionary prices can not be a substitute for providing an accessible and inclusive sporting venue.
F. Contact

Centre for Access to Football in Europe (CAFE)

Email: info@cafefootball.eu
Skype: cafe-football
Web: www.cafefootball.eu

F. Contact

Dr. Christoph Bertling & Inga Oelrichs
German Sport University Cologne
Institute for Communication and Media Research (IKM)
Am Sportpark Münnersdorf 6
50933 Cologne

Email: bertling@dshs-koeln.de | i.oelrichs@dshs-koeln.de
With thanks to those who took part in this survey, and to the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS), Council of Europe.

Project funded by EPAS.
We would appreciate if you could fill out the following questionnaire, which will take you approximately 15 minutes.

The survey focuses on disabled spectator (and complimentary companion) ticket sales at large sporting events and some of the existing issues that may disadvantage disabled people. The aim of the research is to find a sustainable solution that ensures the dignity and respect of disabled people whilst ensuring that tickets are best allocated to genuine disabled spectators by the event owners and that companion / personal assistant tickets are also provided (with no additional costs to the disabled person) where required.

(Please remember that not all disabled people are visibly ‘disabled’ and some disabled people will have a hidden disability and / or specific requirement to enable them to access a live match day or other sporting event.)

All responses remain STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

-----

SURVEY

1) Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person? v1
   Yes / No

2) Are you answering this questionnaire on behalf of a disabled child? v2
   Yes / No
3) Are you answering this questionnaire on behalf of a disabled person whom you support as a companion / personal assistant on match or event days? v3  
Yes / No

4) Which sport do you most often attend? V4

   a) Football
   b) Rugby
   c) Basketball
   d) Handball
   e) Volleyball
   f) Cricket
   g) Athletics
   h) Other
   i) If other, please specify..........

5) Approximately how many times a year do you attend sporting events in your country?  
(Not at all; Less than once a year; 1-5 times a year; 6-10 times a year; 11-15 times a year  
16-20 times a year; more than 20 times a year) v6

   a) Do you attend home events / matches? V7
      Yes / No

   b) Do you attend away events / matches? V8
      Yes / No

6) Approximately how many times a year do you attend sporting events in another country?  
(Not at all; Less than once a year; 1-5 times a year; 6-10 times a year; 11-15 times a year  
16-20 times a year; more than 20 times a year) v14

7) Considering your own experiences and other disabled spectators you may know. Would you say that there are enough tickets available to disabled spectators?

   7a) At home games  v15
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

7b. At away games in your country v16
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

7c) At away games in other countries v17
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

8) Do you feel that you are given sufficient time to buy tickets to sport events? v20
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently; I am a season ticket holder)

9) Is there generally a delay in the selling and allocation of tickets for disabled spectators? v21
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

10) In your opinion, do you believe there to be a problem with the mis-selling of disabled spectator tickets to non-disabled spectators. (Please remember that not all disabled people are visibly disabled and some will have a hidden disability.) If yes, then please answer the following questions - if no, please go straight to question 15. v22

----------

11) Would you say that tickets for disabled spectators and companions / personal assistants are being misused by other people? v23
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

12) Do you believe that you have witnessed tickets for disabled spectators being handed over to other (non-disabled) spectators? v24
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

13) Would you be offended if you witnessed or were made aware of disabled spectators tickets being used by unauthorized persons? v25
Yes/ No

14) In your opinion, how much abuse do you believe there to be around disabled spectators tickets? v26
(There is no abuse; there is very little abuse; there is some abuse; there is moderate abuse;
15) Do you usually obtain your disabled spectator tickets at reduced costs/concessionary prices? v27
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

16) If you had to choose, would you prefer to see equal facilities for disabled spectators as those already available to non-disabled spectators or cheaper tickets? v28
(Equal facilities; Cheaper tickets)

Experiences in your home country

17) Do you usually have to show ‘proof of disability’ to qualify for a disabled spectator and companion / personal assistant ticket at events in your own country? v29
Yes / No

If yes, please specify below

17a. At you club / venue v30
     (Once a year / season; every time you purchase a ticket)

17b. At away clubs / venues v31
     (Once a year / season; every time you purchase a ticket)

18) What documents / proof are you currently asked or expected to provide as ‘proof of disability’? v35
19) Thinking about when you have been asked to provide ‘proof of disability’ to obtain disabled spectator tickets (and a companion / personal assistant ticket), please consider the following statements and what best describes your personal experiences? Please select all that apply.

19a. I have issues understanding the request for ‘proof of disability’. V36
   Yes / No

19b. I do not understand which ‘proof of disability’ documents are required by the organiser / club (of the event or match). V37
   Yes / No

19c. There is a lack of consistency between different sports and stadia in asking for me to provide ‘proof of disability’. V38
   Yes / No

19d. I resent having to provide ‘proof of disability’ more than once a year. V39
   Yes / No

19e. I have problems transmitting my ‘proof of disability’ documents (e.g. scanned copies by fax or email) to the ticket provider/event owner. V41
   (At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

19f. My ‘proof of disability’ is not accepted. V42
   (At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

20) Is the current system for providing ‘proof of disability’ in your own country a practical one? V46
   (Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)
Experiences in other countries

Even if you haven’t personally attended a sport event in another country we would still be interested in your opinion based on your knowledge of the experiences of other disabled spectators you know. If you prefer to leave this question blank please go straight to the next page.

21) Do you have to show ‘proof of disability’ at events in other countries? v47
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently; I haven’t attend an International competition to date)

22) Have you experienced any of the following when considering a request for ‘proof of disability’? Please select all that apply:

22a. I have difficulties in understanding the request for ‘proof of disability’. V48
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

22b. I do not understand which documents are essential as ‘proof of disability’. V49
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

22c. My ‘proof of disability’ is not accepted. V50
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

22d. I have problems transmitting my ‘proof of disability’ documents (e.g. scanned copies by fax or email) to the ticket provider/event owner. V51
(At no time; rarely; now and again; frequently, very frequently)

22e. I resent having to provide ‘proof of disability’ more than once a year. V53
(Yes, No)

22f. There is a lack of consistency from different sports and stadia in asking for me to provide ‘proof of disability’. V54
(Yes, No)
23) Is the current system for providing ‘proof of disability’ when attending events in other countries a practical one? V58
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

------------------

The following questions concern ‘proof of disability’ in general – regardless of the country.

24) Do you believe that the requirement to provide ‘proof of disability’ (for disabled spectator and companion / personal assistant tickets) is treated in different ways by different sporting event owners? V59
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree or disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

25) Do you believe that a standardised system of checking for ‘proof of disability’ could reduce abuse? V60
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

26) Do you believe that there should be a standardised system in place to manage ‘proof of disability’ when requesting disabled spectator and their companion / personal assistant tickets? V61
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

27) Did you feel discriminated against by having to provide ‘proof of disability’ to qualify for a disabled spectator and companion / personal assistant ticket for sports events you have attended in the past? V62
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

28) Do you believe that the purchase of a disabled spectator and companion / personal assistant ticket should be based on trust – even if abuse is more likely to occur? V63
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)
Please consider the following:

29) Would you appreciate the introduction of a standardised ‘proof of disability’ system for sport events in your country? v64
   (Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

30) Would you appreciate the introduction of a standardised ‘proof of disability’ system that is only valid for sport events in other countries? v65
   (Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

31) Would you appreciate the introduction of a standardised ‘proof of disability’ system that is valid for sport events in your country and in other countries? v66
   (Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree)

32) Do you believe that a standardised European ‘proof of disability’ ID card could solve the current problem of the misuse of disabled spectator tickets by some non-disabled people in Europe? (Please remember that not all disabled people are visibly disabled and some will have a hidden disability) v67
   (Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree)

33) Do you consider that a standardised European ‘proof of disability’ ID card would make your life easier when purchasing disabled spectator and companion / personal assistant tickets? v68
   (Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

-----

34) Would you be happy to show a ‘proof of disability’ ID card once a season or year, at the start of a new qualifying campaign, or before the start of a tournament before attending a sporting event or match? v69
   (Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

35) Would you be happy to show a ‘proof of disability’ ID card every time you attend a sporting event or match? v70
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

36) Would you feel discriminated against if a ‘proof of disability’ ID card included further details such as ‘disability’ categories (e.g. wheelchair user, blind and partially sighted person or deaf and hard of hearing person, etc.) to help reduce abuse and to optimize organizational issues? v71
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

37) If a ‘proof of disability’ ID card was introduced, in your opinion, which organisation should or could become the custodian? v72
   a) European Commission;
   b) Sporting Event Owners;
   c) Other
   d) If other, please specify .................. Specification v73

38) Would you object to the sporting event owner having a database to store information about you for future events and tournaments? V74
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

39) Would you welcome a European standardised ‘proof of disability’ ID card which could be valid for other cultural events (e.g. museums, theaters, cinemas, etc.) as well? V75
(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree)

40) Please select your country of residence? V76
(Selection: States of the European Union - please include other in case an international)

41) What is your nationality? V77
(Selection: States of the European Union - please include other in case an international)

42) Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person? V78

Yes □ No □
42b) If yes, do you consider yourself to be:

☐ Blind / partially sighted person v80
☐ Deaf / hard of hearing person v81
☐ An ambulant disabled person e.g. difficulty walking (not a wheelchair user) v82
☐ A wheelchair user v83
☐ A learning or intellectually disabled person v84
☐ A person with mental ill health v85
☐ A person with a chronic health condition v86
☐ Other v87
If other, please specify: v88
☐ Prefer not to say v89

-----------

About Yourself

For the purposes of this survey, it would be helpful to know a little more about you. Please you take a few minutes to answer the following equality monitoring questions about yourself.

Please remember that all responses remain STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

If you are answering this questionnaire for a disabled person you support please provide us with his / her information.
Age

43) What age were you on your last birthday? v91
   Prefer not to say v90

Gender

44) Are you: Male Female Prefer not to say v92

44b) (Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?)
   Yes No Prefer not to say v93

Ethnicity

45) How would you describe yourself?

White
   □ European □ Non-European
   □ Other, please say:
   □ Prefer not to say

   □ Roma □ Gypsy □ Traveller □ Other, please say:
   □ Prefer not to say

Mixed Heritage
   □ European □ Non-European
   □ Other, please say:
   □ White and Black Caribbean □ White and Black African
☐ White and Asian
☐ Other, please say:
☐ Prefer not to say

Asian
☐ European       ☐ Non-European
☐ Other, please say:
☐ Indian          ☐ Pakistani       ☐ Bangladeshi   ☐ Chinese
☐ Other, please say:
☐ Prefer not to say

Black
☐ European       ☐ Non-European       ☐ Other, please say:
☐ Caribbean       ☐ African           ☐ Other, please say:
☐ Prefer not to say

Sexual orientation

46) Which of the following options best describe how you think of yourself? V103

Heterosexual / Straight       Bisexual       Homosexual / Gay male
Lesbian / Gay Female          Prefer not to say

Do you define yourself differently – Please specify: v104
Religion or belief

47. How would you describe the religion to which you feel you belong? V105

Please specify: v106 Prefer not to say □

Thank you taking the time to complete our survey. A summary report of the findings will be published later this year. If you wish to receive a copy, please provide us with your email address

For further information please contact the Centre for Access to Football in Europe

www.cafefootball.eu | info@cafefootball.eu
CAFE has been asked to share this research with the Disability unit at the European Commission, and our understanding is that this project will be used to inform their wider body of work in exploring the possibilities for a European-wide Disability ID card.

About CAFE

Centre for Access to Football in Europe (CAFE) is a European wide charity established to achieve equal access to football - Total Football Total Access. CAFE is working with key stakeholders towards one clear aim; a more accessible and inclusive matchday experience for disabled supporters across Europe.

CAFE has been funded by UEFA since its inception in 2009 when it was awarded the UEFA Monaco prize and also delivered the official UEFA EURO 2012 Respect Inclusion project in Poland and Ukraine. CAFE maintains a strong presence in both host nations, delivering an on-going legacy project having been the official charity of UEFA EURO 2012. In 2012, UEFA made a further commitment to access and inclusion for disabled fans by appointing CAFE as its CSR associate partner until 2017.

To assist stadiums and their clubs, UEFA and CAFE have published 'Access for All' - the UEFA and CAFE Good Practice Guide to Creating and Accessible Stadium and Matchday Experience. This guide sets out UEFA and CAFE’s minimum requirements and provides a benchmark of good practice for both new and existing stadiums. Access for All is available in 13 languages.

For more about CAFE please, contact us at info@cafefootball.eu, call +44 (0) 1244 893586 or Skype us at cafe-football.