European Sport Model 2030: Who Pays for Solidarity?

Sport Singularity · Strategic Foresight Series Version 0.5 · Reading edition · Evidence cutoff: 12 September 2026

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

Money shared within sport does not automatically make a local session affordable. A payment to a professional club, support for a sports hall and help with a child's registration fee serve different purposes.

Here, solidarity means sharing money, facilities or effort to support the wider sport community.

Our suggested first step is to **follow one existing funding route before promising more activity**. Find out what it pays for, who can use the service and whether families or volunteers cover any shortfall.

By 2030, funders may increasingly expect evidence of who benefits from shared resources. That is this report's foresight interpretation, not an established European trend. The evidence also does not show that solidarity funding is generally disappearing.

Start with the whole local picture

Use this map to ask about contributions, rather than assume every organisation provides all of them.

THE PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONS BEHIND LOCAL SPORT

Affordable local sport

Families and volunteers

What they support

Participation fees and unpaid time

What to ask

What does taking part cost in money and hours?

Clubs and federations

What they support

Coaching, organisation and development programmes

What to ask

Which part of the local offer has dependable support?

Municipalities and public or lottery funders

What they support

Facilities and participation support

What to ask

Who can use the service, and on what terms?

Competition organisers and sport programmes

What they support

Payments to clubs, associations and development work

What to ask

Who receives the money first, and what benefit is intended?

If reliable income falls short of an affordable offer's cost, reserves or another funder must cover the difference, families may pay more, volunteers may do extra work, or sessions may shrink. This is a possibility to investigate, not a measured European pattern. Record a well-supported finding that no such gap exists too.

Why the policy debate matters

The Commission expects its strategic sport document by the end of 2026; its consultation raises revenue distribution and grassroots sustainability. Parliament's resolution of 7 October 2025 calls for stronger links between professional and grassroots sport. Neither establishes a new funded entitlement. [Commission update](), [Parliament's official summary]().

The EU sport work plan covers July 2024 to December 2027, with voluntary working formats. Article 165 permits support measures but excludes making national laws uniform under that sport power. Neither alone creates a compulsory European solidarity charge; other EU law still applies. Work plan, Article 165.

Post-2027 Erasmus+ finances remain unsettled. The Council's May 2026 position does not settle the programme's budget, and Parliament's record still said a committee decision was awaited on 12 September. The proposed €40.8 billion is for the whole programme, not an agreed sport allocation. Keep possible grants separate from secured income. Council position, Parliament procedure.

In the 2023 C-333/21 judgment, the Court required evidence of concrete user benefits in the centralised football-rights arrangement it examined. Paragraphs 236 to 238 leave assessment, including financial evidence, to the referring court. This neither approves nor abolishes all redistribution rules, and does not settle another sport's legal position. Judgment.

Follow each kind of money separately

The examples below concern different currencies, periods and places. Some are budgets or allocations; others are reported payments. **Do not add them together**, or count the same grant again when it enters a recipient's accounts.

DIFFERENT POTS OF MONEY, DIFFERENT PURPOSES

01

UEFA payments to non-participating men's clubs

Amount and period

€308 million paid in 2024/25, compared with €178.5 million in 2023/24.

What this does not show

The July 2026 scheme mainly serves eligible top-division professional clubs. It does not measure amateur-club or household benefit, or each recipient's spending. Financial report, eligibility.

02

UEFA HatTrick VI

Amount and period

€935 million budget for July 2024 to June 2028: association development, facilities, operations and incentives, including grassroots activity.

What this does not show

This is not an annual payment or a budget wholly for mass participation. Programme.

03

IOC Olympic Solidarity

Amount and period

USD650 million development and assistance budget for 2025 to 2028.

What this does not show

A global budget, not a European allocation or measured expenditure. IOC plan, hosted by UWW.

04

Norway's Norsk Tipping surplus allocation

Amount and period

Approximately NOK4.116 billion for sport in 2026, including NOK535 million for local clubs and associations.

What this does not show

An allocation, not verified spending or total Norwegian sport finance. Norway is outside the EU. Government announcement.

05

France's pass Sport

Amount and period

€50 towards registration in 2026/27. One route covers ages 6 to 17 with a CAF/MSA family quotient of €699 or less; disability and student routes also exist.

What this does not show

Programme rules do not show take-up, reimbursement performance or remaining family costs. Ministry announcement.

Next, follow the route to its local end. Development and fairer competition are legitimate aims; they should not be described as cheaper participation without checking that connection.

FOLLOW THE MONEY ALL THE WAY TO THE ACTIVITY

	First recipient		Check at the local end
Competition solidarity payments	Eligible professional clubs	→	What benefit is intended, and does any of it reach community participation?
Development programmes	Associations, coaches, training programmes or facilities	→	Which groups gain usable opportunities?

Public or shared-service support	**First recipient** Clubs, venues or local operating capacity	→	**Check at the local end** Are suitable sessions available at an affordable total cost?
Registration support	**First recipient** Check the initial payee; support offsets an eligible participant's registration bill	→	**Check at the local end** Do equipment, transport, timing or exclusion still prevent attendance?

Look beyond balanced accounts

One German club study reports membership fees as the largest income category and 72.7% of clubs with balanced or positive accounts for 2022. In its 2023 survey, 62.4% used municipal facilities, which does not mean all use was free. These are weighted national findings, not current European rates. National report, methods.

Yet 17.5% saw finding or keeping voluntary officeholders (people holding formal volunteer roles) as a threat to their club's continued existence in 2023. That is a reported concern, not a bankruptcy rate, and comes from the same study. DOSB account.

Money may not be the main obstacle. The Commission's 2022 Eurobarometer summary identified lack of time as the main reported barrier to activity. That is dated background. Check session times, transport, safety and belonging alongside fees. Survey summary.

More reporting can consume volunteer time. More events may bring income while adding travel, staffing and environmental costs. Examine both sides before expanding either.

Three possible futures for 2030

These futures describe different arrangements, not predictions. Different sports and places could follow different paths at the same time.

2030: THREE POSSIBLE FUTURES, NOT PREDICTIONS

01

A. Reliable shared commitments

Who pays

Competition rights holders and public partners make dependable commitments; federations organise delivery and reporting.

What it means locally

Link multi-year support to affordable services and clear payment terms.

What could go wrong

Funders may prefer other uses. Rising costs, narrow eligibility or demanding paperwork can leave smaller clubs and non-members out.

02

B. Uneven support

Who pays

Some commercial competitions prosper; where other support and reserves fall short, families, volunteers or reduced activity cover gaps.

What it means locally

Promise only what secured funding and delivery capacity can support.

What could go wrong

A successful competition can coexist with unaffordable or shrinking local provision. This does not require all revenue to fall.

03

C. Shared local services

Who pays

Municipalities, taxpayers, lottery proceeds and sporting partners jointly support access across sports.

What it means locally

Share usable venue time, coaching and participation assistance, including provision beyond club membership.

What could go wrong

Public budgets may be unstable; larger providers may dominate decisions. Partners must share control and consider wider costs, including gambling-related costs.

New organisers could also enter these negotiations. The NBA/FIBA December 2025 announcement expressed an intention to support European basketball; it established no support payment. NBA officials reported final franchise bids in July 2026. Organisational progress is not proof of delivered solidarity, and commercial ownership alone does not determine who benefits. [Joint announcement], [NBA update].

Test two bigger changes too: an interruption in a rights-payment chain, and a lasting public guarantee of access across sports. No imminent failure or Europe-wide guarantee was established here. Watch for payment delays or a funded local pilot with binding access terms; neither is presented as an observed warning. Norway's example cannot simply be copied without examining its trade-offs.

Four choices for the next agreement

These are proposed choices, not guaranteed solutions. A club, federation or municipality can commit only its own resources and authority.

FOUR CHOICES FOR YOUR NEXT FUNDING CONVERSATION

01

1. Trace one funding route

Useful when

A finance lead and willing clubs can access records; useful in all three futures.

Trade-off

Staff time. Stop or redesign if missing records or effort outweigh the decision value.

02

2. Agree multi-year participation support

Useful when

A board or responsible authority has dependable income, delivery capacity and terms partners must honour.

Trade-off

Less flexibility. In uneven funding, limit promises to the secured portion; reopen commitments if support fails.

03

3. Share the cost of one service

Useful when

A partnership lead can agree access and contributions, especially under a shared-service future.

Trade-off

Shared control and coordination. Avoid duplicate funding; stop expansion if access narrows or costs shift to families.

04

4. Delay permanent expansion; protect a funded minimum

Useful when

Funding remains uncertain or capacity is missing.

Trade-off

Waiting can miss useful agreements and preserve exclusion. Specify the minimum offer and a review date.

Start shared provision with an existing venue or service. A municipality should check access across sports; a club should check practical delivery. Neither can assume another organisation or household will absorb a cost.

Try an eight-week learning exercise

The question is whether following one route reveals a useful funding gap **or confirms that an assumed gap is absent**. A proposed finance lead would work with three willing clubs with different income and facility arrangements, and a municipal counterpart where relevant. Nobody has been recruited or appointed.

EIGHT WEEKS TO UNDERSTAND ONE FUNDING ROUTE

01

1. Agree the question and effort

Who leads	What to do
Proposed finance lead and participating organisations	Choose one existing route and service. Obtain record access; agree a proposed ceiling of two working days per organisation across eight weeks.

02

2. Follow the money

Who leads	What to do
Finance staff and club representatives	Compare commitments, receipts, dates and permitted uses. Separate overlapping funds and overhead from the service supported.

03

3. Check the local experience

Who leads	What to do
Club lead with a participant perspective	Record total participation charges and administrative effort. Attendance alone cannot show additional access or what caused it.

04

4. Decide what changes

Who leads	What to do
Relevant board or public decision-maker	Continue only if payments can be matched to records, a meaningful choice changes or is credibly confirmed, and effort stays within the agreed ceiling.

Use existing records. Stop or redesign if access is unavailable, overlapping funds cannot be separated, or the work adds administration without helping a decision. This is a proposed learning exercise, not an impact evaluation or a programme already running.

Watch five things

All roles are proposed and unassigned; no monitoring service is active.

1. **EU decisions — policy lead, 15 December 2026.** The strategic document is expected and later funding unsettled. Check whether a published decision names relevant funding, responsible bodies or eligible groups.
2. **Payment terms — finance lead, 15 January 2027, agreed payment dates and next renewal.** Establish local receipts and evidence requirements first. Review commitments after a missed payment or changed eligibility.
3. **Public and registration support — partnership lead, 15 January 2027.** Local receipts and take-up remain unknown. Investigate differences from plans that change the service budget.
4. **Family costs and volunteer time — delivery lead, 15 November 2026.** Start with a local baseline, then agree what change in fees, attendance or hours would threaten the affordable offer. No European fee ceiling is proposed.
5. **New organisers' support — policy/finance lead, 15 December 2026.** Look for binding terms and payment evidence beyond the NBA/FIBA intentions and organisational steps already reported.

Keep a separate test for the 2030 interpretation: record what evidence funders require now and why they set agreement terms. At the next renewal, compare like-for-like requirements and documented reasons. Stronger requirements that affect terms support the idea locally; unchanged requirements, with other reasons governing decisions, weaken it. Missing records are a gap, not disproof. One federation cannot establish a European trend.

The eight-week exercise tests a local funding route, not whether accountability demands are increasing. Reliable, fair access with little hidden burden would reduce the case for intervention. If timing or belonging is the main barrier, change service design. Record non-change as well as change.

Evidence limits: this AI-assisted desk study uses primary policy and legal material, institutional accounts, programme rules and a national club survey available by 12 September 2026. Public institutions and men's football are more visible in this evidence than informal participation. Germany, France and non-EU Norway are contrasting examples, not a representative European sample. No new interviews, local financial audit, causal participation study or current Europe-wide household-cost estimate were conducted. Women's sport, disability sport, rural and informal provision, smaller markets and people who left sport need stronger direct representation. Affordable, inclusive participation and honest labour/environmental costs are this report's stated preference. Sport Singularity may benefit from advisory interest; no option requires buying its services.