UCLA Luskin Center for History and Policy

NEIGHBORHOOD TOOLKIT

Dr. Tawny Paul, Anaghime Esmeralda Ziani, Pilar Taylor

July 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	1
Historical Analysis: Los Angeles 1984 Olympic Games	3
Historical Analysis: London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games	5
Historical Analysis: Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup	7
Historical Analysis: Paris 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games	9
Neighborhood Cultural Offer Toolkit for LA28	11
Bibliography	17
Image sources	19

OVERVIEW

This report supports museums, cultural organizations, neighborhood associations, and other community partners developing neighborhood cultural programming for the LA28 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The report begins with historical analyses of four previous mega-events: the Los Angeles 1984 Olympic Games, the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, the Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup, and the Paris 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Each case examines how cultural activity was distributed, coordinated, communicated, and delivered across a host city or region. The analyses draw on available historical and institutional evidence. They identify relevant precedents and limitations without assuming that earlier models can be transferred directly to Los Angeles.

Across the four cases, effectiveness is defined as evidence of:

- Reach and participation: audience reach, opportunities for public participation, and geographic distribution.
- Local ownership: the involvement of local organizations, artists, cultural practitioners, and neighborhood partners in shaping and delivering programming.
- Cohesion: the shared identities, program strands, communications systems, and coordinating structures that connect individual activities to a wider cultural offer.
- Legacy readiness: the relationships, skills, resources, cultural assets, and delivery systems that can continue to benefit communities after the Games.

The historical analyses lead to a practical toolkit for LA28. The central lesson from the historical cases is that strong neighborhood cultural offers combine a distributed footprint, meaningful local participation, a recognizable shared identity, accessible public programming, and practical delivery infrastructure. Their success also depends on how closely programming reflects the character, relationships, cultural assets, and priorities of the neighborhoods in which it takes place.

The toolkit presents institutional questions and planning considerations that organizations can use to assess their readiness, identify partners, select appropriate locations and formats, strengthen accessibility and communications, and plan for evaluation and legacy. It is designed to support local decision-making across organizations of different sizes and capacities.

This report forms part of a wider series of LA28 cultural-planning resources. Where relevant, it directs readers to companion reports that provide more detailed analysis of governance, audiences, accessibility, institutional planning, and cultural legacy.

WORKING DEFINITION: CULTURAL OFFER

The combined program of exhibitions, performances, festivals, public art, heritage activities, workshops, and other cultural experiences available to audiences during a defined period. Activities may be produced independently while remaining connected through a shared calendar, identity, communications system, or coordinating framework.

NEIGHBORHOOD CULTURAL ACTIVATION

Cultural programming developed in relation to a particular neighborhood and its communities, histories, organizations, cultural assets, and public spaces. It may serve local residents, Games-time visitors, or both, with neighborhood partners playing a meaningful role in shaping and delivering the activity.

DISTRIBUTED PROGRAMMING

Cultural activity delivered across multiple institutions, neighborhoods, or public spaces. A distributed approach can extend the geographic reach of a cultural offer, although its success depends on coordination, accessibility, clear communications, and sufficient resources for participating organizations.

LOCAL OWNERSHIP

The meaningful involvement of neighborhood organizations, artists, cultural practitioners, and residents in shaping and delivering cultural activity. This may include setting priorities, proposing projects, interpreting local histories, selecting participants, managing resources, and evaluating outcomes.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS: LOS ANGELES 1984 OLYMPIC GAMES

Olympic Torch Tower of the Los Angeles Coliseum," U.S. Air Force photograph, 28 July 1984, public domain, via Wikimedia Commons.

Cultural offer and delivery structure

The 1984 Olympic Arts Festival used a geographically distributed model, presenting 72 performing arts productions and more than 30 visual arts exhibitions at 48 venues. Programming took place in theaters, museums, parks, and other settings across the Los Angeles region (LAOOC, 1985). The LA84 case provides a useful precedent for geographic distribution and institution-based delivery, while also showing that geographic reach does not necessarily ensure local artistic representation.

In several program areas, Festival organizers approached arts organizations with established projects and invited them to propose activities that would strengthen their existing work while adding what the official report described as a "special Olympic character." The film program followed this partner-led approach. Organizations including the American Film Institute and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences assumed responsibility for defined parts of the wider cultural offer (LAOOC, 1985).

Festival programming was also presented with established local institutions, including the Craft and Folk Art Museum, Plaza de la Raza, and the Huntington Library. At Plaza de la Raza, the Folklife Festival featured more than 50 Los Angeles artisans associated with traditional Mexican arts and attracted approximately 50,000 visitors. The Craft and Folk Art Museum organized the International Festival of Masks and Masks in Motion, combining exhibitions with performances, demonstrations, workshops, and public participation. The Masks in Motion parade attracted approximately 22,000 people, while programming at the Craft and Folk Art Museum received approximately 20,000 attendees (LAOOC, 1985).

The LA84 case study also highlights the potential reach of cultural programming in outdoor civic and neighborhood settings. TOPSail '84, a large-scale maritime spectacle, drew an estimated 1.2 million people to beaches along the Los Angeles coastline. Although its scale differs from most neighborhood programming, the example is relevant to LA28 because it shows how cultural activity can extend along coastal areas, public corridors, and gathering spaces outside conventional venues (LAOOC, 1985).

Audience reach and access

The Festival reported sales of approximately 306,000 performing arts tickets and revenue approaching $5 million. Tickets were available through direct mail, Ticketmaster, and venue box offices, creating several routes through which audiences could access the program (LAOOC, 1985).

The official report also recorded attendance, venue, and run-length information for individual exhibitions and festivals. The level of detail varied across the program, although these entries created an administrative record of basic audience reach and event delivery. This offers a useful precedent for establishing proportionate reporting requirements across a distributed LA28 cultural offer.

PARTICIPATION, ACCESSIBILITY, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LA28

Accessibility and cultural participation

The Festival included the National Theatre of the Deaf, whose productions brought together spoken English and American Sign Language and featured Deaf and hearing actors. Its inclusion provides an important example of disability culture and artistic practice within the cultural program (LAOOC, 1985).

Accommodations addressed the needs of wheelchair users and people with visual, hearing, mobility, or other physical disabilities. Seats were assigned for individual performances, and patrons received advance instructions about ticket exchanges and venue arrangements.

For LA28, the case study suggests that shared access procedures can support audiences across multiple venues. A contemporary system would need to account for a wider understanding of disability access and incorporate accessible digital communications, transportation information, sensory considerations, captioning, interpretation, and venue-specific guidance.

Olympic and Paralympic cultural continuity

The 1984 Paralympic Games were held in Stoke Mandeville and New York, separate from the Los Angeles Olympics. The International Paralympic Committee attributes this separation to the absence of formal relationships between the relevant disability-sport organizations and the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee (International Paralympic Committee, n.d.). This experience underscores the importance of integrated planning for LA28: cultural planning should encompass both Games from the outset and involve disabled artists, cultural workers, organizations, and audiences throughout program development, commissioning, communications, delivery, and evaluation.

Evidence gaps and limitations

The official record documents venues, productions, ticket sales, and attendance, but provides limited evidence about resource allocation, local decision-making, consistent evaluation, long-term community benefits, or Olympic–Paralympic coordination. Geographic reach and attendance therefore cannot fully establish neighborhood ownership, equitable investment, or lasting benefits. The Festival's geographic reach should be distinguished from local representation, as its international orientation drew criticism for the limited inclusion of Los Angeles artists (Drake, 1983).

LA28 TAKEAWAYS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVATIONS

The LA84 case study suggests that a distributed cultural offer can benefit from established institutions, provided geographic reach is accompanied by meaningful local participation. Museums and cultural institutions could usefully cosnider the following:

- Invite proposals from organizations with existing community relationships and allow their knowledge and ongoing work to shape the program.
- Consider beaches, parks, commercial corridors, and other gathering spaces alongside museums and formal cultural venues.
- Create shared ticketing, registration, accessibility, and audience-information systems early enough for participating organizations to integrate them into their planning.
- Use consistent, proportionate reporting measures across programs, including attendance, participation, neighborhood reach, accessibility, partner roles, and longer-term outcomes.
- Plan Olympic and Paralympic cultural activity as a continuous program, and involve artists and organizations that reflect the neighborhood's diversity throughout its governance and delivery.

Related resources: See *Governance, Roles, and Cultural Activation Pathways* and *Cultural Legacy* reports.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS: LONDON 2012 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Photograph by Ank Kumar, CC BY-SA 4.0, via Wikimedia Commons.

Cultural offer and its structure

The Cultural Olympiad launched in 2008 as a four-year, UK-wide program developed "by and for communities." It combined major curated projects and commissions with two engagement programs—Open Weekend and Inspire—that used an "open-source" approach to encourage multiple forms of ownership and enable local communities to create art connected to the Games (Garcia, 2013).

Governance evolved over the course of the Cultural Olympiad. Stakeholders formed a Cultural Olympiad Board to oversee the program and appointed a director. Delivery was also supported by regional Creative Programmers and local authorities, which helped connect national coordination with activity developed across different parts of the United Kingdom (Garcia, 2013).

Evidence of effectiveness for neighborhood-style activation

The evaluation estimated 43.4 million public engagements across the Cultural Olympiad, including 38.5 million free audience or participant experiences. The culminating London 2012 Festival generated approximately 15.4 million free experiences, exceeding its commitment to provide 10 million free opportunities (Garcia, 2013).

The evaluation also provides evidence of localized participation. At one event, 96 percent of surveyed audience members came from the region in which it took place, 57 percent lived within a 15-minute drive, and 92 percent agreed that events of this kind helped bring the local community together. Because these figures relate to a single event, they should not be generalized across the entire Cultural Olympiad. They nevertheless illustrate the potential for locally delivered activity to reach nearby residents (Garcia, 2013).

Cohesion and discoverability

City dressing, the "Look of the Games," and shared branding helped connect separately produced activities to a recognizable Games-time cultural identity. The London 2012 case study illustrates the value of giving a distributed cultural offer a coherent public presence that helps audiences identify and navigate related programming (Garcia, 2013).

Evidence relevant to different organization types

Museums and heritage organizations supported participatory activity alongside exhibitions and public events. Thousands of young people were recruited to reinterpret museum collections and co-curate exhibitions. The Discovering Places program invited participants to explore built and natural heritage across the United Kingdom, including lesser-known local places (Garcia, 2013).

For community organizations and other locally rooted partners, the open-source structure created opportunities to develop activities connected to their own places and constituencies while participating in the wider Cultural Olympiad. The case study therefore provides a relevant precedent for connecting locally developed programming through a shared mega-event framework (Garcia, 2013).

Disability and inclusion as a program strand

Unlimited was described in the evaluation as the largest UK commissioning program of its kind for work by Deaf and disabled artists. Developed throughout the Cultural Olympiad, it supported 29 commissions across art forms and culminated during the Paralympic Games (Garcia, 2013).

The program positioned Deaf and disabled artists as cultural producers within the wider cultural offer. Its commissioning model and prominent Games-time presentation provide a useful precedent for incorporating disability arts into LA28 programming from its earliest stages.

Olympic–Paralympic cultural continuity

Unlimited's culmination during the Paralympic Games created a deliberate connection between the Cultural Olympiad and the Paralympic period.

The London 2012 case study highlights the value of planning Olympic and Paralympic cultural programming as a continuous offer, with disabled artists and organizations involved throughout its development and delivery (Garcia, 2013).

Evidence gaps and limitations

The evaluation provides strong evidence on overall scale, participation, program structure, branding, and governance. It offers less systematic information about venue-level operations, including permitting, policing, and staffing. It also identifies data limitations for Open Weekend, Inspire, and other components, restricting what can be established about the consistency and longer-term effects of locally delivered activity (Garcia, 2013).

LA28 TAKEAWAYS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVATIONS

The London 2012 case study suggests that broad neighborhood participation depends on accessible entry points, local delivery support, a coherent public identity, and coordination strong enough to connect independently produced activities. Museums and cultural institutions could usefully cosnider the following:

- Combine open opportunities for neighborhood participation with curated, high-visibility commissions that give the wider program a recognizable narrative.
- Prioritize free and low-cost participation, particularly outside ticketed Games venues.
- Begin with accessible routes for local participation, then strengthen coordination as the program grows.
- Use shared branding, communications, and wayfinding to connect activities delivered by different organizations.
- Establish local coordination roles that help participating organizations navigate funding, permitting, accessibility, staffing, and communications.
- Integrate Deaf and disabled artists into both Olympic and Paralympic cultural planning from the outset.
- Establish consistent, proportionate reporting requirements across all program strands.

Related resources: See *Governance, Roles, and Cultural Activation Pathways* and *Planning for LA28 Audiences* reports for evidence on nonticketed audiences and distributed activity.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS: QATAR 2022 FIFA WORLD CUP

Cultural offer and its structure

The FIFA Fan Festival at Al Bidda Park was Qatar 2022's most visible large-scale cultural activation platform. Official reporting positioned it as a central hub for international and local fans. Its offer combined live match broadcasts, food and beverage services, and extensive entertainment programming (FIFA, 2022a; FIFA, 2023).

A citywide institutional cultural offer operated alongside the Fan Festival. Qatar Museums presented a season of exhibitions spanning sport, heritage, and contemporary art for audiences visiting during the tournament. This included World of Football at the 3-2-1 Qatar Olympic and Sports Museum (Qatar Museums, 2022).

Evidence of effectiveness for neighborhood-style activation

Official reporting states that the Fan Festival received approximately 1.86 million visits during the tournament. It welcomed an average of 70,000 visitors per day and presented 146 musical artists across 162 hours of live music (FIFA, 2022a; FIFA, 2023).

The Qatar 2022 case study illustrates the reach that a concentrated, high-footfall cultural hub can achieve when it combines entertainment, match viewing, food, and other public experiences within a single destination. The parallel museum and exhibition program also provided visitors with cultural opportunities beyond the primary festival site.

Public scheduling and communications

FIFA maintained a public program for Fan Festival performances. A consolidated schedule helped audiences identify activities, plan visits, and understand how entertainment related to the wider tournament experience (FIFA, 2022a).

For a distributed LA28 cultural offer, a shared public calendar could perform a similar coordinating function across museums, neighborhood organizations, cultural venues, and public spaces.

Accessibility systems

FIFA's sustainability reporting documents accessibility infrastructure and services at tournament sites and the Fan Festival, including sensory rooms and mobility-support services. It also describes coordinated approaches to accessible ticketing and workforce training across operational areas such as transportation, security, and food and beverage services (FIFA, 2023).

The Qatar 2022 case study highlights the importance of treating accessibility as a shared operational system extending across venues, services, communications, and staff preparation.

Distributed cultural programming beyond the central hub

Alongside the FIFA Fan Festival, cultural programming extended across Doha through public spaces, pedestrian routes, heritage areas, museums, and locations near tournament activity. This wider footprint gave visitors opportunities to encounter cultural programming while moving through the host city, including outside formal match and festival settings (FIFA, 2022b; Qatar Museums, 2022).

Cultural activity around stadiums and other high-traffic locations also created transitional spaces between transportation points, security perimeters, and event venues. These areas incorporated performances, public art, food, crafts, and other forms of cultural participation into the spectator journey. The Qatar 2022 case study illustrates how cultural programming can be located along established audience routes instead of relying exclusively on audiences making separate trips to cultural venues (FIFA, 2022b).

Local cultural representation and participation

The tournament's cultural offer presented Qatari and regional heritage through performances, crafts, food, exhibitions, and public-space programming. Souq Waqif, Katara Cultural Village, Msheireb Downtown Doha, and Qatar Museums institutions contributed distinct settings through which visitors could encounter local cultural practices and narratives during the tournament period.

The available documentation provides greater detail about the scale and visibility of these activities than about how individual artists, practitioners, businesses, and communities participated in program development and decision-making. For LA28, the case therefore underscores the importance of distinguishing the presentation of local culture from local ownership of the cultural offer.

Evidence gaps and limitations

Official sources document attendance, programming volume, accessibility measures, and the geographic reach of the tournament offer. They provide less consistent evidence about local decision-making, the distribution of resources among cultural partners, neighborhood-level participation, and benefits continuing after the tournament. The available figures therefore establish reach more clearly than local ownership or long-term impact.

LA28 TAKEAWAYS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVATIONS

The Qatar 2022 case study suggests that cultural programming can reach substantial audiences when it is integrated into the routes, gathering places, and public spaces through which visitors already move. Local cultural representation is strengthened when communities and practitioners also hold meaningful roles in shaping and delivering the offer. Museums and cultural institutions can usefully consider the following:

- A single, well-programmed hub can absorb increased visitor demand and create predictable footfall, but it should be connected to complementary neighborhood programming at museums, galleries, heritage sites, and other cultural destinations.
- Publish a coordinated neighborhood-facing schedule, including program pages, maps, and 'what's on' information, early enough to shape travel patterns and reduce duplication.
- Treat inclusion and accessibility as mainstream operational infrastructure for public activations, not as a specialist add-on, and publish it clearly at venue and program level.

Related resources: See the *Planning for LA28 Audiences* report for visitor movement and cultural hubs, and the *Planning Accessible Programming* report for inclusive visitor planning.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS: PARIS 2024 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Photograph by Nicolas22g, CC BY-SA 4.0, via Wikimedia Commons.

Cultural offer and its structure:

The Cultural Olympiad evaluation, commissioned by the Paris 2024 Organizing Committee, examined 2,596 labeled projects encompassing 111,066 activities delivered over four years. The program included a core budget of €41 million dedicated exclusively to new projects created in response to the Games and the Cultural Olympiad's vision (Garcia, 2024).

The cultural offer reached 5,048 host cities, with every region and metropolitan department hosting at least one activity. This territorial distribution was actively supported through 30 calls for projects, which the evaluation identifies as important to stakeholder engagement, geographic reach, and the development of thematic responses (Garcia, 2024).

A Cultural Olympiad label provided a common framework for participating projects. The evaluation describes the label as a mechanism for aligning projects with the program's cultural vision and core criteria while allowing activity to be developed by organizations across different places and sectors (Garcia, 2024).

Evidence of effectiveness for neighborhood-style activation

The geographic reach of the program provides evidence of a widely distributed cultural model. Its combination of calls for projects, shared eligibility criteria, and a common label enabled organizations across France to connect locally delivered activity to the wider Cultural Olympiad (Paris je t'aime, n.d.).
The evaluation reports that 70 percent of projects were free. It also found that 50 percent of the projects attracting the largest audiences included a digital component. Free access was associated with greater audience diversity for some large-scale works (Garcia, 2024).

Games-time anchoring

The evaluation identifies 68 "iconic projects" presented during the Olympic and Paralympic torch relays or in and around official venues during the Games. These prominent projects created a visible Games-time layer within the much broader territorial program (Garcia, 2024).

Cohesion and public recognition

The evaluation records differing views of the Cultural Olympiad label. Some project leaders valued its ability to attract broader audiences and encourage collaboration, while others prioritized the visibility of their own organizational brands. Although the label received approval as a noncommercial Olympic and Paralympic designation, it excluded the official rings and logos to avoid brand conflicts. This facilitated approval but limited public recognition (Garcia, 2024).

The Paris 2024 case study highlights a practical tension for distributed cultural programming: a shared identity can connect independently delivered activities, but its value depends on whether audiences can recognize it and understand what it represents. For LA28, any common neighborhood-program identity would need consistent use, clear communications, and visibility through official channels.

Local partnerships and program development

The Cultural Olympiad brought together cultural organizations, sports organizations, public authorities, artists, and other local partners. The evaluation found that 67 percent of projects involved at least one partnership between the cultural and sports sectors. Calls for projects and the shared label provided a framework through which these organizations could develop activities reflecting their own locations, audiences, and institutional capacities (Garcia, 2024).

This structure supported broad participation while allowing projects to retain distinct local identities. For LA28, the case study suggests that common eligibility criteria and open calls can create multiple entry points into a distributed cultural offer. Smaller organizations may still require practical assistance to participate successfully, including support with applications, partnerships, accessibility, communications, and evaluation.

Cultural participation and inclusion

Many projects combined artistic activity with participatory formats intended to connect culture and sport.

The official evaluation records efforts to reach young people, disabled participants, and communities with limited prior access to cultural programming. Free admission expanded access across the program, although the available evidence does not establish consistently who participated in every locality or whether participation continued beyond individual activities (Garcia, 2024).

The Cultural Olympiad extended across both the Olympic and Paralympic periods. Projects involving disabled artists and participants contributed to this continuity, although the evaluation indicates that disability inclusion varied across the wider program. For LA28, shared accessibility expectations should apply across all participating projects, with disabled artists and organizations involved in program design as well as delivery.

Evidence gaps and limitations

The evaluation documents the program's scale, geographic distribution, partnerships, and access models, but identifies uneven reporting across projects. The evidence establishes broad reach more clearly than the depth of local influence, consistency of participation, or longer-term benefits for organizations and communities.

LA28 TAKEAWAYS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVATIONS

The Paris 2024 case study suggests that calls for projects and a shared program identity can distribute cultural activity widely, but local participation requires adequate support, recognizable communications, and consistent methods for documenting who benefits. Museums and cultural institutions could usefully consider the following:

- Support territorial distribution through recurring calls for projects and straightforward eligibility criteria that neighborhood organizations can realistically meet.
- Do not treat label/mark design as a graphic afterthought. Paris shows that legibility and public recognition can remain limited even when a label is formally approved.
- Create a readable and consistently applied neighborhood-program identity, supported by clear usage requirements for size, placement, and minimum public information.
- Plan evaluation infrastructure before the busiest period. Paris's response-rate challenges indicate that smaller organizations may struggle to complete intensive reporting during peak delivery without additional support.

Related resources: See *Governance, Roles, and Cultural Activation Pathways* for calls for projects and delivery structures, and *Museum Continuity During Mega-Sporting Events* for institutional planning considerations.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVATION PLANNING TEMPLATE

Applying the Case-Study Findings

The preceding case studies identify recurring considerations for neighborhood cultural activation, including local partnerships, accessible routes into participation, coordinated delivery, public visibility, audience access, and continuity beyond the Games. The following tables translate those findings into practical considerations for Los Angeles museums and cultural organizations. They are intended to guide institutional discussion and early planning while allowing each organization to develop an approach appropriate to its capacity, neighborhood relationships, and proposed activation. They do not prescribe a single model for every institution or community.

Clarifying Purpose and Intended Audiences

The case studies demonstrate that cultural programs can serve different purposes and audiences during a mega-event. Institutions should identify their priorities before selecting a format or location.

Planning consideration	Questions for institutions	Evidence from the case studies
Local purpose	What neighborhood need, cultural priority, or institutional goal will the activation address? What would make it valuable to local residents during the Games?	LA84 connected Olympic cultural programming with organizations already serving particular communities. London 2012 supported locally developed activity within a broader national program.
Priority audiences	Is the activation intended primarily for neighborhood residents, existing audiences, Games visitors, nonticketed audiences, families, young people, disabled and Deaf audiences, or another group?	London 2012 reached large audiences through free programming, including highly localized participation at some events. Qatar 2022 demonstrated the reach of programming connected to major gathering sites.
Relationship to regular activity	Will the activation extend existing institutional work, adapt a proven program, or introduce a new offer?	LA84 invited established organizations to develop projects that strengthened their existing work while connecting it to the Olympic Arts Festival.
Olympic and Paralympic relevance	How will the activation connect meaningfully to the Games without allowing Games branding to substitute for a clear cultural purpose?	London 2012 used commissions, public participation, and cultural-sports partnerships. Paris 2024 established program criteria through its Cultural Olympiad label and calls for projects.
Resident and visitor balance	How will the program remain useful and accessible to local audiences while responding to increased Games-time visitation?	Across the cases, free public programming and activity outside ticketed venues created opportunities for residents and visitors to participate.

Identifying Partners and Decision-Making Roles

Institutions should define how local organizations, artists, and residents will influence the activation, as the presence of neighborhood partners does not by itself establish meaningful participation.

Planning consideration	Questions for institutions	Evidence from the case studies
Existing relationships	Which organizations, artists, businesses, and cultural practitioners already hold knowledge and trusted relationships within the neighborhood?	LA84 programming drew on the established cultural expertise of Los Angeles institutions, including Plaza de la Raza and the Craft and Folk Art Museum.
Early participation	At what stage will neighborhood partners become involved: concept development, artist selection, location planning, delivery, communications, or evaluation?	London 2012's locally developed activity show the value of involving organizations as producers.
Decision-making authority	Which decisions will partners be able to shape? Are their responsibilities and authority clear?	The case-study evidence establishes broad partnership activity more clearly than the distribution of decision-making power, making this an important area for LA28 to document explicitly.
Compensation and resources	Will community partners, artists, and cultural practitioners be compensated for planning time, cultural knowledge, outreach, and delivery?	Paris 2024's wide territorial model shows the potential of open participation, while also indicating the importance of sufficient support for organizations with different capacities.
Equitable participation	Could application requirements, timelines, insurance, permitting, or administrative burdens exclude smaller organizations?	London and Paris created several routes into their cultural programs. LA28 institutions should examine whether those routes are realistically accessible to organizations with limited administrative capacity.
Accountability	How will partners raise concerns, revise plans, and assess whether agreed responsibilities have been fulfilled?	The limited evidence on local authority and resource distribution across the cases indicates a need for clearer partnership documentation and accountability.

Strengthening Communications and Discoverability

A distributed cultural offer requires a recognizable identity and reliable information. Audiences must be able to understand what is available, where it is located, and how to participate.

Planning consideration	Questions for institutions	Evidence from the case studies
Shared identity	How will the activation connect visibly to the wider LA28 cultural offer while retaining the identity of the institution and neighborhood?	London 2012 used shared branding, city dressing, and the "Look of the Games" to connect independently produced activities.
Public recognition	Will audiences understand what the shared identity or label signifies?	Paris 2024 found that its Cultural Olympiad label helped connect projects, although restrictions on official imagery limited public recognition.
Central information	Will the activity appear on a coordinated calendar, map, website, or visitor platform? Who will maintain accurate information?	Qatar 2022's consolidated public scheduling helped audiences identify and plan around festival programming.
Neighborhood communications	Which local organizations, media, schools, businesses, faith communities, libraries, and resident networks can reach intended audiences?	The localized participation documented in London suggests the importance of communications rooted in the places where activities occur.
Wayfinding	How will audiences move between transit, cultural sites, public spaces, and nearby activities?	Exposition Park and Qatar's high-footfall public areas demonstrate the potential value of connected destinations and audience routes.
Accessible and multilingual information	Are schedules, access details, prices, transportation information, and program descriptions available in appropriate languages and accessible formats?	Cross-venue participation depends on consistent and usable audience information, particularly for visitors unfamiliar with an institution or neighborhood.
Communications capacity	Does the organization have sufficient staff and resources to maintain Games-time information and respond to changes?	A shared identity is useful only when participating organizations can apply it consistently and keep public information current.

Planning for Accessibility and Operations

Accessibility should be incorporated into program design, communications, transportation, staffing, and audience services from the beginning.

Planning consideration	Questions for institutions	Evidence from the case studies
Disabled artists and cultural workers	Are disabled and Deaf artists and organizations involved in developing and producing the cultural offer?	London 2012's Unlimited program commissioned work by Deaf and disabled artists and gave it prominent presentation during the Paralympic period.
Physical and sensory access	Does the location provide step-free access, accessible seating, rest areas, sensory accommodations, and suitable facilities?	Qatar 2022 incorporated accessibility services, including sensory spaces, into tournament operations.
Communication access	Will information be available through captioning, ASL interpretation, audio description, accessible digital formats, and multilingual communications where appropriate?	The cases indicate that access depends on coordinated audience information and services as well as physical entry to a venue.
Transportation and arrival	Can audiences obtain reliable information about accessible transportation, drop-off points, entrances, security procedures, and distances within the site?	Qatar 2022 treated accessibility as a system spanning transportation, venues, workforce preparation, and other operational areas.
Permits and permissions	Which public agencies, property owners, or Games-related bodies must approve the activity, and how early must applications begin?	The London evaluation offers limited venue-level evidence about permitting and operations, highlighting an area LA28 institutions must address directly.
Shared systems	Which services could be coordinated across participating institutions rather than developed independently?	London's regional coordination and Qatar's cross-operational accessibility systems illustrate the value of shared support.

Evaluating Outcomes and Supporting Continuity

Evaluation should extend beyond attendance and geographic reach. Institutions should document who participated, how partners contributed, what audiences experienced, and whether any relationships or benefits continued.

Planning consideration	Questions for institutions	Evidence from the case studies
Audience reach	How many people participated, when did they attend, and how did they encounter the activation?	All four cases document attendance or participation to varying degrees, demonstrating the value of consistent basic reporting.
Intended audiences	Did the activation reach the residents or groups it was designed to serve? What evidence will establish this?	London's localized audience findings show the value of collecting information about where audiences come from, while also demonstrating the limits of generalizing from individual events.
Quality of participation	Did audiences observe, participate, create, learn, or contribute to decisions?	Attendance figures alone cannot distinguish between brief exposure and substantive cultural participation.
Partner influence	How did neighborhood organizations, artists, and residents shape the activation? Were they satisfied with their roles and compensation?	The case studies provide limited evidence about the distribution of authority, making partner experience an important area for LA28 evaluation.
Accessibility	Which accommodations were requested and used? What barriers remained for audiences, artists, and staff?	LA84 and Qatar demonstrate the value of documenting access requirements and services as part of program operations.
Organizational effects	Did participation strengthen or strain the institution's staffing, finances, partnerships, visibility, or audience relationships?	Evaluation should capture institutional consequences as well as public attendance.
Neighborhood effects	Did the activation generate benefits, disruption, new relationships, or additional demands within the surrounding area?	Geographic distribution cannot by itself establish neighborhood benefit. Local experience should therefore be documented directly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

City of Los Angeles – City Clerk. "2028 Cultural Program for the Olympic and Paralympic Games – Planning Update and Framework" (7 Oct 2025, PDF).
https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2015/15-0989-S41_rpt_cad_10-07-25.pdf

Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee (LAOOC). "Official Report Los Angeles, 1984 – Olympic Arts Festival" (PDF hosted by Antenna Theater).
https://www.antenna-theater.org/antest/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/1984OlympicsArtsFestival_LA.pdf

LA84 Foundation Digital Library. "Olympic Arts Festival: 1 June–12 August, 1984" (collection entry referencing Official Report, Chapter 25).
https://digital.la84.org/digital/collection/p17103coll32/id/572/

Beatriz Garcia (Institute of Cultural Capital). "London 2012 Cultural Olympiad Evaluation – Summary" (PDF).
https://www.beatrizgarcia.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Garcia2013London2012COEvaluation-Summary.pdf

Drake, Sylvie. 1983. "Theaters Feel They're Left Out of Festivities." Los Angeles Times, June 1983. Reproduced in "The 1984 Olympic Arts Festival Negotiations," Matrix Theatre Company.
https://www.matrixtheatre.com/press/the-1984-olympic-arts-festival-negotiations

FIFA Publications. "FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 – FIFA Fan Experience" (Annual Report 2022 web chapter).
https://publications.fifa.com/en/annual-report-2022/tournaments-and-events/fifa-world-cup-quatar-2022/fifa-world-cup-qatar-2022-fifa-fan-experience/

FIFA Publications. "FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 – In Numbers" (Annual Report 2022 web chapter).
https://publications.fifa.com/en/annual-report-2022/tournaments-and-events/fifa-world-cup-quatar-2022/fifa-world-cup-qatar-2022-in-numbers/

FIFA Publications. "Final Sustainability Report – Cultural Understanding: FIFA Fan Festival™ and fan zones" (web chapter).
https://publications.fifa.com/es/final-sustainability-report/social-pillar/cultural-understanding/fifa-fan-festival-and-fan-zones/

FIFA Publications. "Final Sustainability Report – Accessibility at the tournament" (web chapter).
https://publications.fifa.com/de/final-sustainability-report/social-pillar/accessibility/accessibility-at-the-tournament/

International Paralympic Committee. n.d. "Stoke Mandeville & New York 1984 Paralympic Games."

Qatar Foundation. "Welcoming the World" (World Cup story page, Education City Fan Experience; includes accessibility and inclusive cultural activation details).
https://stories.qf.org.qa/world-cup/welcoming-the-world/

Qatar Foundation. "QF launches Accessibility Guide ahead of FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™" (story page).
https://www.qf.org.qa/stories/qf-launches-accessibility-guide-ahead-of-fifa-world-cup-qatar-2022-™

Qatar Foundation. "Qatar for All: Your Accessibility Guide (text-only PDF)" (Aug 2023 PDF).
https://assets.ctfassets.net/2h1qowfuxkq7/4MMus2DFrPgYDdTc8PxGkB/1a3aff97ad790629129094ecbff303a0/Accessibility_Guide_TEXT_ONLY_2023_Aug.pdf

Qatar Museums. "Fall 2022: An Exhibition for Every Interest" (includes World Cup-related exhibition listings).
https://qm.org.qa/en/stories/all-stories/fall-2022-exhibitions/

Qatar Museums. "Accessibility" (official accessibility statement page).
https://qm.org.qa/en/accessibility/

National Museum of Qatar. "Accessibility" (official accessibility page with formats and services).
https://nmoq.org.qa/en/visit/accessibility/

Beatriz Garcia. "Paris 2024 Cultural Olympiad Evaluation" (Oct 2024 PDF).
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/64d11ec5a9dd7e4e83dac000/t/683ee84d9daaea35cfe21147/1748953177385/Paris2024-RAPPORT-OLYMPIADE-CULTURELLE_ENG.pdf

Paris je t'aime (Paris Tourist Office). "Paris 2024 Games: the Cultural Olympiad" (web page).
https://parisjetaime.com/eng/article/cultural-olympiad-paris-a871

Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. 1985. Official Report of the Games of the XXIIIrd Olympiad Los Angeles, 1984. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. Chapter 25, "Olympic Arts Festival."

LA84 Foundation. n.d. "Olympic Arts Festival: 1 June–12 August, 1984." LA84 Foundation Digital Library.

International Paralympic Committee. "Stoke Mandeville & New York 1984" (web page).
https://www.paralympic.org/stoke-mandeville-new-york-1984

IMAGE SOURCES

U.S. Air Force. "Olympic Torch Tower of the Los Angeles Coliseum." Photograph, 28 July 1984. Public domain. Wikimedia Commons. Unknown, U.S. Air Force, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons, Unknown, U.S. Air Force, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons, "Olympic Torch Tower of the Los Angeles Coliseum," photograph by Unknown, U.S. Air Force, 28 July 1984. Retrieved from Wikimedia Commons: File: Olympic Torch Tower of the Los Angeles Coliseum.jpg. Public domain (U.S. federal government work). .

Kumar, Ank. "London Carnival during 2012 Cultural Olympiad." Photograph. CC BY-SA 4.0. Wikimedia Commons. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:London_carnival_during_2012_Cultural_Olympiad_(Ank_Kumar)_03.jpg

Nicolas22g. "Grand Palais – Paris 2024 Olympics Venue." Photograph. CC BY-SA 4.0. Wikimedia Commons. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Grand_Palais_-_Paris_2024_Olympics_venue.jpg