

Who will pay for the local sport offer through 2030?

Sport Singularity · Decision brief Version 0.5 · Reading edition · Evidence cutoff: 12 September 2026

For municipality staff and community sport club managers For funding and service decisions from 2027 · Looking ahead to 2030

Follow one existing funding route before promising more activity. Check what arrives, what it supports and whether families or volunteers cover any gap. A finding that existing arrangements work is useful too.

Three reasons to look more closely

The Commission expects its strategic sport document by the end of 2026. Post-2027 Erasmus+ finances remain unsettled in the inspected Council and Parliament records. Possible grants are not secured income. [Commission](#), [Council](#), [Parliament](#).

UEFA reported €308 million paid to non-participating men's clubs in 2024/25, up from €178.5 million in 2023/24. The scheme mainly serves eligible professional clubs, so this does not show cheaper community participation. [Accounts](#), [eligibility](#).

German findings combine 72.7% of clubs with balanced or positive 2022 accounts and 17.5% seeing difficulty finding or keeping voluntary officeholders (people holding formal volunteer roles) as a threat to their club's continued existence in 2023. These come from one national study, not current European rates. Check unpaid capacity alongside cash. [Study](#), [DOSB account](#).

Evidence of who benefits also matters: C-333/21 required concrete user benefits to be substantiated in the centralised football-rights arrangement examined. It does not settle another sport's legal position. [Judgment](#).

Match the choice to local support

Three possible futures are dependable shared commitments, uneven support with local gaps, and jointly funded services across sports. These are alternatives, not predictions.

FOUR CHOICES FOR YOUR NEXT FUNDING CONVERSATION

01

Trace one route

Useful when

Records can clarify a decision in any future.

Trade-off

Staff time; stop if the work adds little value.

02

Agree multi-year support

Useful when

Funding, delivery capacity and dependable partner terms are secured.

Trade-off

Less flexibility; promise only the funded portion.

03

Share one service

Useful when

Partners can agree contributions and fair access.

Trade-off

Coordination and shared control; avoid duplicate funding.

04

Delay expansion; retain a funded minimum

Useful when

Income or capacity remains uncertain.

Trade-off

Lost opportunities and possible continued exclusion; set a review date.

A small proposed exercise

Consider eight weeks with three willing clubs and a municipal counterpart where useful. Agree a ceiling of two working days per organisation. A proposed finance lead would compare commitments, receipts, dates, permitted uses, a defined service, participation charges and administrative effort, including a participant perspective.

Continue only if payments can be matched to records, a meaningful choice changes or is credibly confirmed, and effort stays proportionate. Stop or redesign if records are unavailable, funds cannot be separated or administration adds no decision value. No owner has been appointed or participants recruited; this is not an impact evaluation.

Keep five checks on the agenda

All roles and dates are suggestions, not appointments.

1. **EU decisions:** policy lead, 15 December 2026 — check actual funding and eligibility rules.
2. **Payment terms:** finance lead, 15 January 2027 and contractual dates — establish receipts and act on missed payments or changed terms.
3. **Public and participant support:** partnership lead, 15 January 2027 — check local receipt and take-up against the service budget.
4. **Family costs and volunteer time:** delivery lead, 15 November 2026 — establish a baseline, then agree a locally meaningful threshold.

5. **New organisers:** policy/finance lead, 15 December 2026 — require binding support terms and payment evidence beyond intentions.

Separately, compare funders' evidence requirements and decision reasons now and at the next renewal. Stronger requirements affecting terms support the longer-term interpretation locally; unchanged requirements with other reasons governing decisions weaken it. Missing records remain a gap. The eight-week exercise cannot establish a European trend.

Change the advice if affordable access already works well or timing and belonging matter more than funding. This is AI-assisted desk research, without new interviews or a local financial audit. The full report provides the evidence limits. No option requires buying a service.