

Thank you for your emails on this subject.

Let me say first that I have taken a detailed personal interest in this matter. Indeed it was at my initiative (and that of David Ross) that KPMG were appointed to carry out the recent review and we were also instrumental in the choice of the lead consultant on the project as both David and I had confidence in him on the basis of his track record and experience and in particular his work for David on the review of Olympic preparedness carried out this June. I have also been determined - and made clear to others - that if a strong case were made out in the review for moving venues, especially on cost grounds, then I would not be dissuaded simply by the argument that it would be difficult to get agreement from the IOC or international sporting federations. I have also had a number of meetings to challenge the emerging conclusions from the review.

On the points you raise with me KPMG concluded that in relation to the equestrian venue Greenwich would be the cheapest option because any out of London venue would require provision of a satellite village for competitors, extra security and transport spend and there would still need to be a modern pentathlon show jumping arena constructed in London. In addition the cost of the equestrian event is overwhelmingly in delivering the show jumping arena, stabling and back of house facilities and not the cross country course. Moving the cross country course on its own would mean significant extra cost as it would require an additional set of stables; media, back of house and support facilities; and additional security and transport costs. I have also had a presentation from the cross country designer and event manager now employed by LOCOG which convinced me, particularly the evidence from the experience of the cross country course used in Hong Kong, that the impact on the park from the event is likely to be acceptable.

In relation to Bisley KPMG concluded that there would be no cost saving compared with Woolwich as again, in addition to the core costs, there would need to be a satellite village for competitors and additional security and transport costs. They also identified significant delivery risks at Bisley, in particular the need to reach agreement with the large number of clubs with leases there to secure exclusive access and the possibility extra work and cost might be required to upgrade the existing security fence.

I know people feel strongly about these issues which is why I have devoted significant time and trouble to ensuring they were thoroughly reviewed independently and all the arguments examined in detail. On these issues though I have come to the view that there is no basis to challenge further the review conclusions which are accepted and supported by all other members of the Olympic Board.

Best wishes,

Boris Johnson