TRAINING FACILITIES AND YOUTH INVESTMENT LANDSCAPE 2020
Welcome to the first edition of the UEFA Training Facility and Youth Investment Landscape.

One of UEFA’s key roles as the governing body of European football is to help raise standards both on and off the pitch. Training facilities and youth academies are at the very core of the European football ecosystem, and with the integration of more developed training infrastructure requirements in the 2018 Club Licensing & Financial Fair Play regulations, the importance of these two components has been further emphasised. As the specific needs and resources vary considerably between national associations, UEFA encourages each licensor to set the infrastructure standards for their licence applicants and proactively develop them. This report presents a first overview of the picture across Europe following the introduction of the updated licensing requirements.

Building on a survey commissioned in summer 2019, the UEFA Intelligence Centre now has – for the first time ever – comprehensive information on 950 training facilities used by 673 clubs across 54 countries. The survey contained more than 60 questions on clubs’ training facilities and youth investment and following efforts from many of European football’s stakeholders, this report is born.

This first edition features in-depth analysis of the level and types of investment in clubs’ training facilities and showcases some of the very finest and latest examples of new projects undertaken across the continent. Over €1 billion has been invested by Europe’s top division clubs in the last decade, with more than three quarters of clubs commissioning and completing upgrades. Also included, are insights into youth player development in Europe and the investment by top division clubs, partly financed by UEFA via club solidarity payments.

In addition to this report, UEFA will publish the “UEFA Best Practice Guide to Training Centre Construction and Management” in the near future. This report will include a step-by-step guide to training centre design, construction and management, setting out the key concepts to consider when planning facility development from both a sporting and operational perspective.

The UEFA Training Facility and Youth Investment Landscape was built on a collaborative effort of a great many clubs and national association licensing managers, as well as numerous colleagues, to whom we extend our thanks. We hope you enjoy this edition.

UEFA Intelligence Centre
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I TRAINING FACILITIES &amp; DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>II COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>44 ALBANIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OVERVIEW</td>
<td>46 ANDORRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 HIGHLIGHTS</td>
<td>48 ARMENIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FACILITIES</td>
<td>50 AUSTRIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 USAGE</td>
<td>52 AZERBAIJAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>54 BELARUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 INVESTMENT</td>
<td>56 BELGIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 YOUTH BUDGET</td>
<td>58 BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 UEFA SOLIDARITY PAYMENTS</td>
<td>60 BULGARIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 YOUTH PERSONNEL</td>
<td>62 CROATIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 HOT SPOTS</td>
<td>64 CYPRUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>66 CZECH REPUBLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 RECENTLY COMPLETED</td>
<td>68 DENMARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 LOOKING AHEAD</td>
<td>70 ENGLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 READER’S GUIDE</td>
<td>72 ESTONIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74 FAROE ISLANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76 FINLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78 FRANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 GEORGIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82 GERMANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 GREECE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86 HUNGARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88 ICELAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 ISRAEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 ITALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94 KAZAKHSTAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96 KOSOVO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98 LATVIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 LIECHTENSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 LITHUANIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 LUXEMBOURG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 MALTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108 MOLDOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110 MONTENEGRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 NETHERLANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114 NORTH MACEDONIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116 NORTHERN IRELAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118 NORWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 POLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 PORTUGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 REPUBLIC OF IRELAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126 ROMANIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128 RUSSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130 SAN MARINO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132 SCOTLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134 SERBIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136 SLOVAKIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138 SLOVENIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140 SPAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142 SWEDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144 SWITZERLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146 TURKEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148 UKRAINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 WALES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gibraltar provided information about only one facility for this questionnaire, located in Spain because of the club’s geographical constraints, therefore Gibraltar does not have a country-specific page. However, Gibraltar’s unique surveyed facility is included in the scope of our analyses throughout the rest of this report.
The UEFA Training Facilities and Youth Investment Landscape is the latest strategic report designed and built by the UEFA Intelligence Centre. All the analyses, insights and descriptive metrics featured in the next pages build on a unique dataset collected by UEFA, in close collaboration with National Associations, Leagues and Clubs across Europe.

Thanks to this coordinated effort, the present report covers a very wide scope of 950 facilities used by 673 different clubs across the 54 UEFA countries. Clubs reported details on one or two of their main facilities. 68% of the surveyed facilities are considered ‘primary’ facilities, the other 32% being labelled as ‘secondary’.

On average, the surveyed facilities have been open and used for 21 years: the oldest facility described in the survey opened 119 years ago, while the most recent was inaugurated less than a year ago.
SELECTED KEY FINDINGS

This report has added relevance in the context of Covid-19. The Covid lockdown is bringing unprecedented disruption and uncertainty to a football world that has enjoyed 20+ years of continuous strong income growth. Transfer fees on U20 prospects have more than tripled in the last five years and attracted a record share of spend in the summer 2019 window, making youth development increasingly lucrative. The combination of massive financial hits plus ongoing uncertainty, is likely to have a significant impact on the transfer and recruitment markets from this summer. On the financial side, youth development and talent exporting is likely to become slightly less lucrative, at least in the short-term. However on the sporting side, with player recruitment conditions difficult, clubs with strong youth development are perhaps in a better position to ride out the storm and build foundations for future success.

>€1bn

Investment by European top division clubs in training facilities over the last decade, with more than three quarters of clubs commissioning and completing upgrades

€870m

Total estimated annual youth development budget of European top division clubs in 2020

The value of solidarity payments generated by UEFA club competitions but distributed to non-participating clubs for youth development have more than tripled in the last ten years

2015/16

$139m

2018/19

$81m

2012/13

$68m

2009/10

$81m

Different clubs and academies that have received youth development funds from UEFA solidarity in the last decade

1’629

The share of overall clubs budgets invested in training facilities ranges from an average of 3% (clubs over €50m revenue) to 15% (clubs less than €3m revenue) with the Europewide average share sitting at 4.3%

53

Top tier clubs have inaugurated new training centres in the last two years. Furthermore these clubs are widespread across Europe covering 33 different top divisions

at least

27

Clubs have already announced specific development plans for their training centres demonstrating that infrastructure investments remains high on club football’s agenda

78%

Have become an integral part of top division training facilities underlying the ever evolving context of club football

68%

More than half the clubs share their training facility with other sport organisations. Furthermore, just over three quarters of the clubs that have a women’s section have the teams train at the same facility as the men’s

52%

76%

24%

Less than a quarter of clubs directly own their principal training facility

7 FTE

Is the average number of full-time staff clubs employ on youth development (coaching, education, medical matters etc.), although there is considerable variation

15%

Average number of natural grass and artificial/ hybrid grass pitches available at reported top division training centres

3%

4.3%

2.4

NATURAL GRASS PITCHES

1.5

ARTIFICIAL / HYBRID GRASS PITCHES

The share of overall clubs budgets invested in training facilities ranges from an average of 3% (clubs over €50m revenue) to 15% (clubs less than €3m revenue) with the Europewide average share sitting at 4.3%
TRAINING FACILITIES
The following two pages detail the distribution and use of natural grass and artificial grass pitches across the 54 UEFA member associations. Training on artificial grass tends to be found mostly in northern European leagues where clubs contend with more adverse weather conditions than clubs based in southern European countries. The graphic below shows how clubs in Finland, Sweden, Norway and Russia have a tendency to utilise artificial/hybrid pitches at their training facilities.

**FULL-SIZE PITCH DISTRIBUTION ACROSS EUROPE**

There are more than 2,750 full-size pitches across the training facilities of the 673 top division clubs which participated in our study. On average, natural grass training pitches are still the preferred choice, with 2.4 grass pitches per club compared to 1.5 artificial pitches. Danish clubs have the highest total number of full-size pitches, coming second in both the number of grass and artificial pitches. This can be attributed to the Danish model where all top-level clubs have direct links between their grassroots sections and their senior teams. In addition to full-size pitches, Denmark also reported the highest number of pitches of adjusted size (i.e. which differ from official full size measurements).

A CLUB’S LOCATION AND LOCAL CLIMATE HAS A MAJOR IMPACT ON ITS USE OF GRASS PITCHES VERSUS ARTIFICIAL PITCHES IN TRAINING

Danish clubs have the highest number of training pitches, with large versatility across the board. On average, Danish clubs have 6.4 full-size natural grass pitches and 2.9 artificial/hybrid grass pitches in place at their training facilities. The surface of Danish football centres are illustrated by the two satellite examples on the right (FC Midtjylland and Brøndby IF). These illustrations highlight the versatility and size of Danish football club grounds.
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Danish clubs have the highest number of training pitches, with large versatility across the board. On average, Danish clubs have 6.4 full-size natural grass pitches and 2.9 artificial/hybrid grass pitches in place at their training facilities. The surface of Danish football centres are illustrated by the two satellite examples on the right (FC Midtjylland and Brøndby IF). These illustrations highlight the versatility and size of Danish football club grounds.

Danish clubs have the highest number of training pitches, with large versatility across the board. On average, Danish clubs have 6.4 full-size natural grass pitches and 2.9 artificial/hybrid grass pitches in place at their training facilities. The surface of Danish football centres are illustrated by the two satellite examples on the right (FC Midtjylland and Brøndby IF). These illustrations highlight the versatility and size of Danish football club grounds.

Danish clubs have the highest number of training pitches, with large versatility across the board. On average, Danish clubs have 6.4 full-size natural grass pitches and 2.9 artificial/hybrid grass pitches in place at their training facilities. The surface of Danish football centres are illustrated by the two satellite examples on the right (FC Midtjylland and Brøndby IF). These illustrations highlight the versatility and size of Danish football club grounds.
More than nine out of ten clubs reported to have medical facilities in place at their training grounds. Furthermore, 87% of clubs reported to also have medical staff present in at least one of their training facilities. The presence of these provisions can in large part be attributed to Club Licensing recommendations as it is an intrinsic part of the system.

**BOARDING FACILITIES FOR YOUTH PLAYERS MOST PREVALENT IN TURKEY AND FRANCE**

This double-spread illustrates where four aspects of training centres are most commonly used. This page outlines the model of youth boarding across Europe, whereas the next page provides an overview of indoor football training facilities, fitness centre equipment and technical tracking systems used across the clubs’ training centres.

For the purposes of this report, youth boarding facilities are defined as: “housing facilities for youth players of the club located in the direct proximity of the training facility”.

These facilities can often be an important asset to clubs in attracting and retaining youth players who may have to travel longer distances in order to be part of their youth academies.

A variant of the model is that of “host families”, in which families living in close proximity to the training facilities accommodate youth players in their homes. This is particularly common in England.

**TOP 10 BY YOUTH BOARDING FACILITIES**

- **89%**
  - Turkey
- **85%**
  - France
- **71%**
  - Germany
- **71%**
  - Spain
- **71%**
  - Denmark
- **70%**
  - Italy
- **69%**
  - Netherlands
- **58%**
  - Switzerland
- **50%**
  - Portugal

In total, just over 200 clubs, across 40 countries, reported to have youth boarding facilities to some degree. The capacity of the youth boarding facility can vary quite significantly from smaller sites of up to 10 youth players, with others reporting on-site capacity for more than 25 youth players.

Turkey reported the highest presence with 16 out of 18 top division clubs having youth boarding facilities in place. *Based on clubs submissions of 7 out of 18 top division clubs.

**EUROPEAN TRAINING CENTRES DRIVING NEW TRAINING EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGIES FORWARD**

More than nine out of ten clubs reported to have medical facilities in place at their training grounds. Furthermore, 87% of clubs reported to also have medical staff present in at least one of their training facilities. The presence of these provisions can in large part be attributed to Club Licensing recommendations as it is an intrinsic part of the system.

Just over half of top division clubs (53%) have medical tracking systems installed at their training facilities, allowing them to closely monitor players’ health and conditioning.

Indoor football training facilities are available at the training facilities of 246 (37%) European top division clubs. There is a link between a club’s local climate and the presence of indoor training facilities. The milder the climate, the more likely clubs are to have indoor facilities. Clubs in the Faroe Islands, England and Iceland top this category. As a minimum standard for this definition, indoor facilities need to include football pitches (hard-cover, grass or artificial) situated in a closed facility.

**% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE INDOOR TRAINING FACILITIES IN PLACE**

- **37%**
  - Europe-total
- **100%**
  - France
- **75-99%**
  - Denmark, Spain, Netherlands
- **50-74%**
  - Italy, Switzerland, Portugal
- **<50%**
  - Other countries
MORE THAN HALF OF CLUBS SHARE A TRAINING FACILITY WITH ANOTHER CLUB

It is fairly common for clubs to share the usage of one or both their training facilities, be it with another top-level football club from the surroundings, or with local other sports institutions (e.g., grass hockey, rugby etc.). In some instances, surveyed clubs even have to let other teams use their facility more than half of the available usage time.

CLUBS SHARING FACILITIES WITH OTHER CLUBS ACROSS EUROPE

TOP 10 COUNTRIES WITH MOST FACILITY SHARING (% of shared facilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 4 countries in Europe, namely Andorra, Finland, San Marino and Wales, 100% of the UEFA-surveyed facilities are actually shared to a certain extent. In these countries, clubs don’t necessarily have the means to operate a facility on a full-time basis and are constrained into finding time and schedule arrangements with other clubs.

ONE IN FIVE FACILITIES ARE OPEN TO ALL CLUBS’ SQUADS, INCLUDING RESERVE, YOUTH AND WOMEN’S TEAMS

The present report provides with valuable data on how clubs operate their training facilities. One important aspect lies in the various usage patterns of the surveyed facilities. While most facilities are used at least by the men’s first and/or reserve team(s), it turns out that surveyed clubs also give great facility and equipment access to their youth teams: 4 of 5 surveyed facilities are somewhat used by a youth team of the club, and 3 of 4 facilities used by clubs’ men’s first team is also used by youth teams of the club. It is also worth noting that almost 30% of main facilities are shared with women’s teams, which compares with a percentage of clubs in our scope that actually have a women’s team (38%).

MAIN NOTABLE USAGE PATTERNS (% of facilities used by type of using squads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Squad Type</th>
<th>Facilities Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s 1st team</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Reserve team</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s 1st &amp; Reserve only team</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (team)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Club’s Squads</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s team</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noticeably, in Luxembourg and Turkey, no clubs declare that they share any of their facilities. Other countries where a small proportion of clubs have to share their facilities include all ‘Big 5’ countries, except Italy, where almost half of surveyed clubs expressed they share their secondary facility with a local club.

TOP 10 COUNTRIES SHARING WITH WOMEN’S TEAM (% of facilities used by clubs’ women’s and any men’s sections at the same time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on UEFA surveyed data, it turns out that in most cases when a club has a women’s section, that section uses the same facility as men’s. While 38% of surveyed clubs have a women’s section, 29% of facilities used by the clubs’ men’s 1st team are also used by their women’s teams. In other words, 76% of surveyed clubs that have a women’s section have that women’s section training on same facility as men’s 1st team.
MORE THAN HALF THE TRAINING FACILITIES ARE OWNED BY MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES

The next two pages lay out the ownership landscape of the training facilities of Europe’s top-division clubs. The graphic below displays the frequency of the various types of facility ownership with the next page providing some additional details on the ownership profiles of Europe’s top division clubs.

The analysis shows municipal authorities are the most common owner, accounting for almost half (47%) of clubs’ facilities across Europe. There are 25 countries where at least half of top division clubs’ training facilities are owned by local authorities. Football clubs themselves are the next most common group of facilities’ owners, with approximately a quarter in this bracket.

TRAINING FACILITIES OWNERSHIP BY CATEGORY

222 of the 950 training facilities covered in this report are directly owned by football clubs themselves. In addition, 88 training facilities belong to the owners of football clubs. Combined, this is equivalent to 33% of all training facilities across all European top division clubs. These 310 club or owner-based training facilities are found across 271 clubs. Of these clubs, almost half (47%) also own their stadium. England, Scotland and Portugal* are the only three countries where at least half of top division clubs own both their stadium and at least one of their training facilities.

The chart below illustrates the top-10 countries by the percentage of clubs that own both their stadium and at least one of their training facilities:

CLUB OWNERSHIP OF TRAINING FACILITIES MORE COMMON THAN OF STADIA

36% of top division clubs own the primary training facility they currently use compared to 18% of clubs owning the stadium they currently use.

There are different forms of facility ownership, other than club or municipal ownership, although these are less common. More details on these can be found below:

In total, 10 clubs across seven different countries use or share training facilities owned by another football club. In Malta, this is most common with four clubs under this model. Another notable example of this is in Ukraine, where Shakhtar Donetsk are currently renting the training facility of FC Arsenal-Kyiv.

* For Portugal, the sample is based on only seven clubs which provided sufficient data related to training facility and stadium ownership.
TOTAL TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURE* INVESTED IN THE LAST 5 YEARS
€1BN+
€2M

The surveyed clubs provided invaluable information on the amounts invested in maintaining, improving or rebuilding their training facilities. Based on data submitted by clubs*, it is safe to say that more than €1 billion has been invested by clubs in the last 5 years across Europe. This significant milestone demonstrates clubs’ commitment to long-term development and sustainability in their operating strategy.

More than €1 billion invested in facilities in the last five years

Hungary stands out as one of the non ‘Big 5’ countries with one of the highest amount invested in the last 5 years. It highlights strong local goodwill to invest in high standards facilities to create the best conditions for future success.

Average reported investment in training facilities in the last 5 years

More than 20% of clubs in 92% of countries reported general infrastructure refurbishments. This form of investment is the most widespread and affordable way to enhance training facilities, but it also requires investment in new pitches or complexes. In all, 41% of clubs reported new pitches in the last 5 years.

Upgrade playing pitches is the most common type of investment in training facilities

This page identifies the various main kinds of investment performed by clubs. These range from a minor improvement to any training pitch watering system to the construction of a brand new facility including state-of-the-art equipment and personnel.

While the most affordable and widespread way used by clubs to enhance their training grounds is to add a new pitch or renovate existing pitches, more than a quarter of surveyed clubs reported more significant improvements to their facilities, be it full refurbishment projects conducted in pre-existing facilities, or construction of entirely new premises, usually located in a dedicated location.

The surveyed clubs also reported a range of other investments, from artificial to natural grass fields to new training complexes.

Adding new natural grass or hybrid/artificial pitches, or improving the existing facilities’ football pitches by adding a number of pitch features is by far the most common type of refurbishment performed by clubs. In 21 countries, half or more than half of facility refurbishments reported by clubs are included in this category, and at least one club reports such investment in 49 of 55 countries. With a total average reported cost of not more than €810 thousands, this type of enhancement is also by far the most affordable type of actions reported by clubs across the board.

Country profiles and notable observations*

* Investment amount data collected from the survey proved very comprehensive, except for a few countries where clubs decided not to provide amount information. Those countries and clubs are excluded from the totals and average displayed above.

Country profiles and notable observations

The map above illustrates the average reported investment per club in training facilities in the last 5 years. TheInvestment in training facilities varies widely across Europe, with some countries reporting significantly higher investments than others. This reflects differences in club finances, local standards, and the level of investment in youth development across the continent.
On average, the 950 facilities surveyed by UEFA have been open and used for 21 years: the oldest facility described in the survey opened 119 years ago, while the most recent was inaugurated less than a year ago. Clubs usually perform maintenance or more significant works in their facilities on a regular basis, to catch up with the latest trends and cope with intensive competitive pressure from their peers. On average, surveyed clubs have proceeded with a significant investment in their facility three and a half years ago. The map below gives details by country: Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Liechtenstein and San Marino are the three countries in Europe where, on average, facilities have been improved less than 2 years ago. Looking slightly further back than the last five years, clubs reported 74% of primary training facilities and 48% of secondary facilities had received a major upgrade in the last ten years.

Again, Hungary stands out as one of the most proactive countries in terms of football infrastructure investment. 69% of surveyed Hungarian facilities have been refurbished less than 2 years ago. The large-scale Puskas Akadémia development program, delivered in Oct. 2018, epitomizes Hungarian clubs’ new ambitions.

One of the most valuable parts of the collected information pertains to investment in clubs’ training infrastructure. Clubs regularly maintain their training grounds, however they also perform more significant investment in their facilities on a regular basis: based on our survey, 502 clubs in 53 countries reported 623 significant upgrade investments in their facilities in the last decade. In total, 66% of all 950 surveyed facilities have been reportedly improved over 2010-2020. As expected, clubs focus on refurbishing their primary facilities: almost three quarters (74%) of them have been improved recently, while a bit less than half of secondary places benefited from improvements.

None of the ‘Big 5’ countries reported that 100% of its clubs significantly improved their facilities recently: in the most wealthy leagues some clubs had already improved their training environment earlier than ten years ago.
Youth training session at the Paris Saint-Germain football academy.
This double spread details the budgets which clubs have allocated for youth development. For the purposes of this analysis the scope of youth development budget has been defined in line with UEFA’s Club Licensing and Financial Fair-Play regulations: “Expenditure on youth development activities means expenditure by a club that is directly attributable (i.e. would have been avoided if the club did not undertake youth development activities) to activities to train, educate and develop youth players involved in the youth development programme in the territory of the member association.”

### Top Division Clubs Currently Invest €870 Million A Year in Youth Development

Youth development programmes come in many shapes and forms across Europe. The chart below illustrates the spread of allocated budget ranges between countries that come from the same geographical region. Apart from the differences between regions and countries, youth budgets can range significantly within the same leagues, for example Austria, Israel, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia and Switzerland have club budgets ranging from less than €500k to more than €5 million.

### There Are 17 Top Divisions Where All Clubs Reported a Youth Budget of Less Than €500k

Despite England having the highest average youth development budget, Germany reported the highest number of clubs in the +€5 million range. This difference can be explained by England reporting higher outlier values than Germany. For example, eight English clubs had a youth budget of more than €7.5 million, for Germany this is only three clubs.

### Top 10 By Average Youth Development Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Number of Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€6.1M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€5.3M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€4.7M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€4.6M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€3.4M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€2.8M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€2.7M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1.9M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1.8M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1.7M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 of the 38 English and German clubs reported a youth development budget of more than €5 million. The full map of clubs with €5m+ spend can be found on page 32.

### Total Annual Youth Development Spend of Top Division Clubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Number of Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€500K-€1M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1M-€2M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€2M-€3M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€3M-€4M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€4M-€5M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;€5M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Illustrative Example

The analysis utilises youth spend provided by clubs for UEFA youth distribution and Financial Fair Play assessments backed up by survey submissions, to provide the most accurate and comprehensive picture of youth development spend.

### Number of Clubs Per Youth Development Budget Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Number of Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€0-0.5M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€0.5-1M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1-2M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€2-3M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€3-4M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€4-5M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;€5M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above illustrates the spread of allocated budget ranges between countries that come from the same geographical region.
MORE THAN A THIRD OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COSTS ACROSS EUROPEAN TOP DIVISIONS ARE COVERED INDEPENDENTLY BY PARENT CLUBS

This double spread shines more light on clubs’ youth development budgets and their financing. The results of this survey indicate six main sources of financing: parent club funding; UEFA solidarity payments; members/families’ fees or contributions; municipal/state authority grants or subsidies; league/national association grants or subsidies and private funding.

Direct funding from parent clubs proved to be the biggest contributor to youth development budget, followed by UEFA solidarity payments and contributions from membership fees and families.

In 27 countries, funding from parent clubs was the most frequent source of financing of club youth budgets.

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BUDGET FINANCING BY CATEGORY*

Just under 250 clubs reported at least 50% of their youth development budgets being financed directly by parent clubs.

There are also other, but less frequent sources of youth development financing, more details on these can be found below:

* The average percentages presented on this page are not the weighted average (e.g. not 37% of €870m covered by Senior club funding) but an average calculation of the submitted percentages. England, Faroe Islands and San Marino did not provide this information.

Subsidies or contributions from domestic leagues or national associations are the fifth largest source of financing reported. Clubs in Montenegro had the highest reporting of the use of this source in Europe (29%).
UEFA SOLIDARITY PAYMENTS ARE THE SECOND LARGEST FUNDING SOURCE

UEFA solidarity payments are distributed via national associations to clubs for investment in youth development programmes and local community schemes. These payments make up an estimated 19% of youth development budgets across Europe’s top division clubs. It is a common source across leagues, with clubs from 30 different countries reporting at least one third of youth development budgets financed by UEFA solidarity payments.

UEFA FUNDING TO CLUBS FOR YOUTH INVESTMENT OVER THE LAST DECADE EXCEEDS €1BILLION

UEFA as the guardian and governing body of European football encourages youth development and training facility construction in many ways. These support mechanisms are in addition to the €966million of direct solidarity payments ringfenced for youth investment that have been distributed in the last decade. Since the payments are linked to rising UEFA competition revenues, by the time 2019/20 funds are released, the aggregate amount across the decade will exceed €1 billion.

The largest single recipient across the decade are Stoke City. The distributions are extremely widespread, covering 1,629 different clubs across the 55 UEFA National Associations including 260 clubs who received in excess of €1million in youth funds from UEFA.
YOUTH PERSONNEL

EUROPEAN TOP DIVISION CLUBS ON AVERAGE DEDICATE 5-7 FTE TO YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COACHING

The next two pages detail the numbers of employees dedicated by European clubs solely to youth development. The same distinctions and definition of youth development has been applied as on the previous pages. The number of employees has been analysed using FTE (full-time equivalent) as an indicator. In this parameter, 1 FTE is equivalent to one person working for 40 hours a week.

For the purposes of this questionnaire, staff entrusted with working on youth development has been broken into five categories:

- Coaching matters
- Medical matters
- Scouting/analysis matters
- Educational matters
- Organisational/logistical matters


avg. number of fte dedicated to youth non-coaching matters

On average, European top division football clubs have 5-7 FTE dedicated exclusively to coaching purposes for youth development. Clubs in Azerbaijan, Italy, Kazakhstan and Russia have the highest full time equivalent numbers for coaching purposes, averaging 16-20 FTE per club.

ITALIAN SERIE A CLUBS HAVE THE HIGHEST AVERAGE NUMBER OF FTE DEDICATED TO YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

The chart below compares the average number of FTE working on youth coaching matters to the average number of staff working on medical, scouting/analysis, education and organisation/logistics matters. The number of staff employed by clubs tends to be linked to revenues, however many eastern European countries show a large number of staff dedicated to youth coaching matters with Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Belarus and the Baltic countries amongst the highest.

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT EMPLOYEES DISTRIBUTION ACROSS EUROPE*

* For the purposes of the analysis presented on this page, only countries where more than half the clubs have submitted Youth Development FTE information have been included to prevent biased results. For this season England, Gibraltar, Portugal and San Marino are excluded from this analysis.

AVG. NUMBER OF FTE DEDICATED TO YOUTH COACHING MATTERS

AVG. NUMBER OF FTE DEDICATED TO YOUTH NON-COACHING MATTERS

TOTAL YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PERSONNEL ABOVE AVERAGE

FOCUS ON NON-COACHING STAFF

FOCUS ON COACHING STAFF

On average, European top division football clubs have 5-7 FTE dedicated exclusively to coaching purposes for youth development. Clubs in Azerbaijan, Italy, Kazakhstan and Russia have the highest full time equivalent numbers for coaching purposes, averaging 16-20 FTE per club.
HOT SPOTS

The map illustrates European top division clubs based on a number of different criteria. Furthermore, it shows how different countries and regions apply varying priorities and practices to their policy and infrastructure.

THE FACILITIES LANDSCAPE ACROSS EUROPE – A BIRD’S EYE VIEW

The concentration of training centres indicates a higher occurrence of large youth boarding facilities (+25 players) in the southern half of UEFA member associations, with more clubs in the northern half of Europe tending to opt for the host family model.

BOARDING FACILITIES +25 YOUTH PLAYERS

NUMBER OF COUNTRIES 32

118 CLUBS

TOP 3

1

2

3
The UEFA survey reveals insights related to the distance between the club’s main facilities and the stadium where official games are played. While more than a third (35%) of clubs train in their stadium or on pitches adjacent to the stadium, an overwhelming majority (87%) of training grounds are located less than 10km from the club’s stadium, a sign of football club’s integration within local communities across Europe.

The relative distance between a training facility or a stadium and the nearest airport is an important criteria when assessing a club’s assets: accessible and well connected venues are sought after in order to minimize the travel burden for players, staff members and club’s executive who may be prone to travel very often across their country and across Europe. On average, clubs’ facilities in Europe are located 30km from their nearest airport.

Almost all clubs get access to an airport within a 200km radius, and only 27% of clubs enjoy the convenience of an airport located less than 10km from their facilities.

In Andorra, training facilities used by surveyed clubs are distant by only 4km. It is the National Association with the highest density of facilities across the survey. On the other side of the spectrum, Kazakhstan stands out as the country where facilities are the most spread out, with an average distance of more than a thousand kilometre between facilities locally.

CS Maritimo Funchal and FC Zhetysu facilities are the most distant across our sample: they are almost 8,000km away from each other. In the opposite, the small city of Strumica in North Macedonia is home to the two clubs who operate the closest facilities across the sample: FK Akademija Pandev AD and FK Belasica GC.
CASE STUDIES OF RECENTLY UPGRADED FACILITIES ACROSS EUROPE

Within the 600+ investment projects surveyed by UEFA, there are a number of cases which particularly typify an individual country’s or club’s development strategy, and others which provide good examples of specific upgrades to pre-existing club infrastructure. This page features notable training infrastructure projects which have been recently completed or announced.

Whilst the most affluent clubs tend to constantly seek the best quality equipment and facilities, it is also important to showcase other clubs which have achieved leaps in their training infrastructure development in the past few years.

NOTABLE TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS RECENTLY COMPLETED IN EUROPE*

As part of the re-development of Schalke 04’s “Berger Feld” training facility, the club has announced a multi-year project which will result in a complete renovation of current facilities. Whilst the first phase of the renovation is covered in this study, including the improvement of training pitches, the club has also announced in the next stage the development of a bespoke stadium for the second team, a new performance centre and additional training pitches.

SCHALKE 04 2021

* Training ground information has been obtained from clubs’ official communications and local specialized media channels. Some projects might be delayed or postponed due to Covid-19 impact which could affect the listed estimated project end date.

RECENTLY COMPLETED

NOTABLE TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS CURRENTLY UNDER DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE*

Looking ahead

This report provides insight into training facilities across European football clubs, with a particular emphasis on recent investments and planned improvements. Given the competitive environment of European football and the increased emphasis placed on talent development, clubs are constantly investing in new training facilities and technologies. This has led to bigger and better training centres being built across the continent.

Here you will find a selection of training facility projects which are yet to be completed, and therefore are not covered in our study, but which provide a snapshot of how many training centres may look in the near future. This is not an exhaustive list of all clubs’ ongoing projects but it does cover a broad selection of some notable case studies.

As part of the re-development of Schalke 04’s “Berger Feld” training facility, the club has announced a multi-year project which will result in a complete renovation of current facilities. Whilst the first phase of the renovation is covered in this study, including the improvement of training pitches, the club has also announced in the next stage the development of a bespoke stadium for the second team, a new performance centre and additional training pitches.

SCHALKE 04 2021

* Training ground information has been obtained from clubs’ official communications and local specialized media channels. Some projects might be delayed or postponed due to Covid-19 impact which could affect the listed estimated project end date.

RECENTLY COMPLETED

NOTABLE TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS CURRENTLY UNDER DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE*

Looking ahead

This report provides insight into training facilities across European football clubs, with a particular emphasis on recent investments and planned improvements. Given the competitive environment of European football and the increased emphasis placed on talent development, clubs are constantly investing in new training facilities and technologies. This has led to bigger and better training centres being built across the continent.

Here you will find a selection of training facility projects which are yet to be completed, and therefore are not covered in our study, but which provide a snapshot of how many training centres may look in the near future. This is not an exhaustive list of all clubs’ ongoing projects but it does cover a broad selection of some notable case studies.

As part of the re-development of Schalke 04’s “Berger Feld” training facility, the club has announced a multi-year project which will result in a complete renovation of current facilities. Whilst the first phase of the renovation is covered in this study, including the improvement of training pitches, the club has also announced in the next stage the development of a bespoke stadium for the second team, a new performance centre and additional training pitches.

SCHALKE 04 2021

* Training ground information has been obtained from clubs’ official communications and local specialized media channels. Some projects might be delayed or postponed due to Covid-19 impact which could affect the listed estimated project end date.

RECENTLY COMPLETED
“Ottmar Hitzfeld Stadium”, FC Gspon - Switzerland
(Highest Pitch in Europe: 2’000m above sea level)
### EXAMPLE: ALBANIA

**General**
- General survey overview by country:
  - number of responding clubs, number and average age of surveyed facilities

**Facilities**
- 0.8
- 2.1
- 25%
- 38%
- Summary of facilities and services in place at the various training facilities per country including:
  - average number of natural and artificial grass pitches as well as percentage of clubs that have indoor football training facilities, fitness centre equipment, medical and technical tracking, collaborations with educational institutions and youth boarding facilities on site in place
  - 88%
  - 75%
  - 100%
  - 25%

**Investment**
- Detailed overview of clubs’ most recent significant investment in training facilities in recent years:
  - percentage of clubs having upgraded one or more facilities in the last ten years:
    - average amount spent per refurbishment, breakdown by project size
  - 36%
  - 17%
  - 0-0.5M
  - 0.5-2M
  - €2-5M
  - >€5M

**Ownership**
- Breakdown of ownership of primary training facilities per country
  - 75%
  - 100%

**Usage**
- Overview of clubs’ facilities usage patterns: shared facilities with other clubs (football or other sports), clubs with a facility solely used by men’s first team, or shared with women’s or youth teams
  - 67%
  - 33%
  - 0-1 FTE
  - 1-2 FTE

**Youth Personnel**
- Overview of average FTE’s (full-time equivalent) dedicated to coaching, medical, scouting, educational and organisation matters per country on a logarithmic scale
  - 0.0001
  - 0.001
  - 0.1
  - 1

**Youth Budget**
- Typical (median) club's youth budget per country with additional breakdown of budget coverage per finance group
  - €0.5M
  - Typical budget
  - 25%
  - Contributions from own
  - 35%
  - Contributions from sponsorships

**Country-relevant insights**
- Country's surveyed clubs in respective country by location they originate from

---

* Average number of pitches include both full size as well as other size pitches. 1.0 other size pitch is equivalent to 0.5 full size pitch.
**ALBANIA**

### General

- **Clubs**: 8
- **Facilities**: 11
- **Average Age of Facilities**: 19.2

### Ownership

- **18%** Football club
- **36%** Private owner
- **36%** Municipal
- **0%** Government
- **9%** Other

### Facilities

- **0.8** Natural Grass Pitches
- **2.1** Artificial Grass Pitches
- **25%** Indoor Training
- **38%** Fitness Equipment

### Usage

- **38%** Sharing Facilities
- **9%** Solely used by Men’s 1st Team
- **13%** Women’s Team Usage
- **88%** Youth Team Usage

### Investment

- **50%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€0.2M** Average spent per refurbishment

### Youth Budget

- **€0.05M - €0.5M**
- **€0.5M - €2.5M**
- **> €2.5M**

### Youth Personnel

- **Averages Full Time Equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:**
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 0.1 FTE
  - Education: 0.1 FTE
  - Coaching: 3 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 1.2 FTE

### Insights

- 36% of the primary training facilities are owned by a private owner related to the club. Nowhere in Europe is this share higher.
- More than half the youth development budgets are funded by UEFA Solidarity Payments.
- In Albania all the clubs reported a form of collaboration between their youth academies and local education institutions.

### Population

- **2,870,000**

### Top Division Clubs

- **12**
- **KF Laçi ••**
- **FK Kukësi**
- **FK Partizani ••**
- **KF Teuta**
- **KS Luftëtari**
- **KF Skënderbeu**
- **KF Tirana**
- **KS Flamurtari**

### Participating Clubs

- One facility / •• two facilities

*Based on clubs’ submissions for refurbishment events occurred in the last ten years. KF Kastrioti and FC Kamza did not provide information for this questionnaire.*
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100% Primary</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

- 0% Football Club
- 0% Private owner
- 38% Municipal
- 13% Government
- 50% Other

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Average Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Grass Pitches</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Usage

- 100% Sharing Facilities
- 0% Solely used by Men’s 1st Team

- 0% Women’s Team Usage
- 100% Youth Team Usage

### Investment

- 0% of Clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.2M Average spent per refurbishment

### Youth Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin of Funding</th>
<th>Typical Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% Private funding</td>
<td>€0-0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Senior club funding</td>
<td>€0.5-2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58% UEFA solidarity payments</td>
<td>&gt;€5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% Contributions league/ state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Contributions membership/ parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:

- Organisation/logistics: 0.1 FTE
- Medical: 0.1 FTE
- Education: 0.1 FTE
- Coaching: 0.1 FTE
- Scouting/ analysis: 0.1 FTE

### Insights

- Only one club reported to have full size natural grass pitches at their training facility with the majority of clubs relying on artificial grass pitches.
- On average, the primary training facilities are just over 7 years old which is the second youngest age across the board.
- Andorran facilities are the most condensed in Europe (only 4km on average between each other).

### Participating Clubs

- FC Encamp
- FC Lusitans
- FC Ordino
- FC Santa Coloma
- Inter Club d’Escaldes
- UE Engordany
- UE Sant Julià
- UE Santa Coloma
ARMENIA

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Football Club</th>
<th>Private owner</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural grass pitches</th>
<th>Artificial grass pitches</th>
<th>Indoor training</th>
<th>Fitness equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sharing facilities</th>
<th>Solely used by men’s 1st team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs that have refurbished their facilities</th>
<th>€0.2M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>€0.0-0.5M</th>
<th>€0.5-2M</th>
<th>€2.5M</th>
<th>&gt;€5M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€0-0.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Dedicated To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation/logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top division revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top division clubs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSIGHTS

| More than a third of the top division training facilities are owned by the Football Federation of Armenia |
| High presence of natural grass pitches which are more than double the number of artificial grass pitches |
| Seven out of ten top division clubs are located in Yerevan. The highest single city concentration of clubs Europewide |
### Azeraijan

#### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ownership

| 25% Football Club | 0% Private owner | 0% Municipal | 38% Government | 38% Other |

#### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Tracking</th>
<th>Technical Tracking</th>
<th>Collaboration with Edu. Inst.</th>
<th>Youth Boarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Grass Pitches</th>
<th>Artificial Grass Pitches</th>
<th>Indoor Training</th>
<th>Fitness Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sharing Facilities</th>
<th>Solely Used By Men’s 1st Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s Team Usage</th>
<th>Youth Team Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38% Clubs that Have Refurbished Their Facilities</th>
<th>€0.3M Averge Spent Per Refurbishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>€0.1M - €0.5M €0.5M - €2.5M €2.5M - €5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33% New Pitches</th>
<th>33% General Infrastructure Improvements</th>
<th>33% Full Refurbishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Youth Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>€0-0.5M Typical Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64% Senior club funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Private funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% UEFA solidarity payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Contributions league/FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Contributions municipal/state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Contributions membership/parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Youth Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Dedicated To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation/logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Insights

- On average, the primary training facilities are just under 6 years old which is the youngest age across all participants.
- Clubs dedicate typically 16-20 FTE to coaching of youth teams. This range is the shared highest value across Europe.
- Noticeably, not a single facility in Azerbaijan is owned by a municipality.
Belarus

General

- 14 clubs
- 26 facilities
- Average age of facilities: 12.9 years

Ownership

- 31% football club
- 0% private owner
- 19% municipal
- 50% government
- 0% other

Facilities

- 2.1 natural grass pitches
- 1.7 artificial grass pitches
- 50% indoor training
- 86% fitness equipment

Usage

- 93% sharing facilities
- 12% solely used by men's 1st team
- 21% women's team usage
- 86% youth team usage

Investment

- 86% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.1M average spent per refurbishment

- 40% general infrastructure improvements
- 20% facility refurbishment
- 30% new pitches

Youth Budget

- €0.0-0.5M typical budget

- Contributions league/state: 19%
- Contributions membership/patrons: 6%
- Education: 12%
- Medical: 3%
- Scouting/analysis: 1.2
- Administration/infrastructure: 1.2
- Recruitment: 1.2
- Coaching: 8.10

Insights

- Half of the primary training facilities in Belarus are owned by the government, the highest percentage of governmental ownership in Europe.
- One of only four countries where no club reported a single significant investment of more than €500,000.
- Twelve of the fourteen top division clubs reported to use more than one training facility.

Participating Clubs

- FC BATE Borisov
- FC Dinamo Brest
- FC Dnepr Mogilev
- FC Gomel
- FC Gorodeya
- FC Isloch Minsk Raion
- FC Minsk
- FC Neman Grodno
- FC Shakhtar Soligorsk
- FC Torpedo Zhodino
- FC Vitebsk
- SFC Slutsk
- FC Dinamo Minsk
- FK Smolevichi

Note: FC Torpedo Minsk and FC Luch Minsk did not provide information for this questionnaire.
Belgium

**General**

- Clubs: 16
- Facilities: 25
- Average age of facilities: 27.2 years

**Ownership**

- 38% Football club
- 35% Municipal
- 8% Government
- 4% Other

**Facilities**

- Natural grass pitches: 5.1
- Artificial grass pitches: 2.8
- Indoor training: 63%
- Fitness equipment usage: 100%

**Usage**

- Sharing facilities: 56%
- Solely used by men's 1st team: 4%
- Women's team usage: 75%
- Youth team usage: 44%

**Usage of facilities**

- Medical tracking: 94%
- Technical tracking: 94%
- Collaboration with Edu. Inst.: 56%
- Youth boarding: 6%

**Investment**

- 94% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- Average spent per refurbishment: €1.0M
- New pitches: 8
- General infrastructure improvements: 5
- Refurbishment: 5
- New pitches: 32%
- General infrastructure improvements: 11%
- Full refurbishment: 5%

**Youth Budget**

- €1.0-2.0M

**Youth Personnel**

- Averaging full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 3 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 1.2 FTE
  - Coaching: 8.1 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 1.2 FTE

**Insights**

- Third highest number of pitches across the board. On average a Belgian club have a total of just over 7 pitches available to them.
- High presence of fitness centre equipment and tracking (technical and medical) facilities on site of training facilities.
- One of only eight countries where a city other than the capital (Brugge) has the highest number of top division teams.

**Participating Clubs**

- Club Brugge KV
- K. Sint-Truidense VV
- KAA Gent
- KAS Eupen
- KRC Genk
- KV Kortrijk
- KV Mechelen
- Royal Antwerp FC
- RSC Anderlecht
- SV Zulte Waregem
- Cercle Brugge KSV
- KV Oostende
- R. Charleroi SC
- R. Excelcior Mouscron
- R. Standard de Liege
- Waasland-Beveren

**Key Info**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Top Division Revenue</th>
<th>Top Division Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.470.000</td>
<td>€391m</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participating Clubs**

- 62% Primary
- 38% Secondary

**Funding**

- Contributions membership/parents: 38%
- Private funding: 5%
- Contributions league/NA: 5%
- Contributions municipal/state: 75%
- Senior club funding: 1%
- UEFA solidarity payments: 45%
- Other: 11%

**New pitches**

- 1
- Full refurbishment: 5%
- General infrastructure improvements: 11%
- Full refurbishment: 5%

**New facility**

- 32%

- Back to Menu
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

GENERAL

- CLUBS: 11
- FACILITIES: 13
- AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES: 22.5

OWNERSHIP

- 17% FOOTBALL CLUB
- 17% PRIVATE OWNER
- 50% MUNICIPAL
- 8% GOVERNMENT
- 8% OTHER

FACILITIES

- MEDICAL TRACKING: 1.4
- TECHNICAL TRACKING: 1.1
- INDOOR TRAINING: 10%
- FITNESS EQUIPMENT: 70%

USAGE

- SHARING FACILITIES: 60%
- SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1st TEAM: 17%
- WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE: 30%
- YOUTH TEAM USAGE: 100%

INVESTMENT

- 100% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
- €0.5M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

YOUTH BUDGET

- €0.0-0.5M TYPICAL BUDGET
- ORIGIN OF FUNDING:
  - 40% Senior club funding
  - 1% Private funding
  - 24% UEFA solidarity payments
  - 3% Contributions league/NA
  - 17% Contributions municipal/state
  - 10% Contributions membership/parents

INSIGHTS

- One of eight countries where all clubs have upgraded their training facilities in the last ten years
- More than half of those upgraded were full facility refurbishments, the highest share European-wide
- The cities of Bijeljina, Sarajevo and Tuzla make up for half the top division clubs

PARTICIPATING CLUBS

- FK Tuzla City
- FK Željezničar Sarajevo
- FK Zvijezda 09
- FK Krupa
- FK Mladost Doboj Kakanj
- FK Radnik Bijeljina
- FK Sarajevo
- FK Sloboda Tuzla
- HŠK Zrinjski
- NK Čelik Zenica
- NK Široki Brijeg

KEY INFO

- POPULATION: 3,502,000
- TOP DIVISION REVENUE: €10m
- TOP DIVISION CLUBS: 12

PARTICIPATING CLUBS:

- NK GOŠK Gabela did not provide information for this questionnaire.

ORGANISATION/LOGISTICS: 3 FTE
- Medical: 1.2 FTE
- Education: 0.5 FTE
- Coaching: 1.2 FTE
- Scouting/analysis: 1.2 FTE
BULGARIA

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Grass Pitches</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Facilities</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely used by Men's 1st Team</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New pitches</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New infrastructure</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass pitch repairs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full refurbishment</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTMENT OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A. / repairs only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€0-0.5M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€0.5-2M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€2.5M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;€5M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions membership/ parents</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private funding</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions league/ NA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA solidarity payments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions municipal/ state</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions membership/ parents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/ analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INFO

Population: 6,970,000
Top Division Revenue: €42m
Top Division Clubs: 14
Participating Clubs: 14

INSIGHTS

Amongst top-10 by number of clubs with youth boarding facilities:

All clubs but one have refurbished their training facilities in the last decade.

Clubs reported an average of 3 FTE for youth development scouting/analysis purposes, only six countries reported a higher number.

PARTICIPATING CLUBS

FC Etar Veliko Tarnovo
PFC Beroe Stara Zagora
PFC Cherno More Varna
PFC CSKA Sofia
PFC Levski Sofia
PFC Lokomotiv Plovdiv 1936
Vitosha Bistritsa
FC Arda Kardzhali
FC Dunav Ruse
FC Tsarsko Selo Sofia
OFC Botev Vratsa
PFC Botev Plovdiv
PFC Ludogorets Razgrad
PFC Slavia Sofia
## General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ownership

- **0%** Football Club
- **7%** Private Owner
- **86%** Municipal
- **0%** Government
- **7%** Other

## Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Tracking</th>
<th>Technical Tracking</th>
<th>Collaboration with Edu. Inst.</th>
<th>Indoor Training</th>
<th>Fitness Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Usage

- **60%** Sharing Facilities
- **0%** Solely Used by Men's 1st Team
- **10%** Women's Team Usage
- **100%** Youth Team Usage

## Investment

- **100%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€0.6M** Average spent per refurbishment

- **1** repair only
- **2** €0.5M
- **1** €0.5-2M
- **1** >€2M

## Youth Budget

- **€0.5-1.0M** Typical budget

## Youth Personnel

- **Average full time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:**
  - Organisation/Logistics: **4 FTE**
  - Medical: **3 FTE**
  - Education: **1-2 FTE**
  - Coaching: **8-10 FTE**
  - Scouting/analysis: **1-2 FTE**

## Key Info

- **Population:** 4,067,000
- **Top Division Revenue:** €48m
- **Top Division Clubs:** 10
  - HNK Gorica ••
  - HNK Rijeka ••
  - NK Istra 1961 ••
  - NK Slaven Koprivnica ••
  - GNK Dinamo Zagreb
  - HNK Hajduk Split
  - NK Inter Zaprešić
  - NK Lokomotiva
  - NK Osijek
  - NK Varaždin

## Insights

- One of eight countries where all clubs have upgraded their training facilities in the last ten years
- All top division clubs have collaborations with educational institutes in place
- No facility is used only by one of the clubs' men's first team
## Cyprus

### Key Info
- **Population:** 870,000
- **Top Division Revenue:** €56m
- **Top Division Clubs:** 12
- **Participating Clubs:**
  - AC Omonia
  - AEK Larnaca FC
  - AEL Limassol FC
  - APOEL FC
  - Apollon Limassol FC
  - Doxa Katokopia FC
  - Ermis Aradippou FC
  - ALKI Oroklini
  - Anorthosis Famagusta FC
  - Enosis Neon Paralimni FC
  - Nea Salamis Famagusta FC
  - Pafos FC

### Insights
- Due to the mild climate condition, clubs rely almost exclusively on the use of natural grass pitches with only two clubs having artificial grass pitches in place.
- Eight highest percentage of club-owned training facilities across Europe.
- Ten of the twelve clubs are located in the three biggest cities of the island: Nicosia, Limassol and Larnaca.

### Typical Budget
- **Origin of Funding**
  - 67% Contributions membership/parents
  - 25% Contributions league
  - 7% Contributions municipal/state
  - 2% Senior club funding
  - 5% UEFA solidarity payments

### Youth Personnel
- **63% Primary**
- **37% Secondary**

### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)
- **47% Football Club**
- **5% Private Owner**
- **26% Municipal**
- **11% Government**
- **11% Other**

### Training Facilities and Youth Investment Landscape 2020

### Facilities
- **Average Age of Facilities:**
  - 12.3 years
- **Equipment Usage:**
  - **58%** Share solely by men’s 1st team
  - **26%** Men’s 1st team and women’s team
  - **75%** Men’s 1st team and youth teams
- **Average Facilities Usage:**
  - **0%** Solo use by youth teams
  - **40%** Solo use by men’s 1st team

### Typical Refurbishment
- **Investment of Clubs that have Refurbished their Facilities:**
  - **n.a.**/repairs only
  - €0-0.5M
  - €0.5-2M
  - €2-5M
  - >€5M

### General
- **Population:** 870,000
- **Top Division Revenue:** €56m
- **Top Division Clubs:** 12
- **Participating Clubs:**
  - AC Omonia
  - AEK Larnaca FC
  - AEL Limassol FC
  - APOEL FC
  - Apollon Limassol FC
  - Doxa Katokopia FC
  - Ermis Aradippou FC
  - ALKI Oroklini
  - Anorthosis Famagusta FC
  - Enosis Neon Paralimni FC
  - Nea Salamis Famagusta FC
  - Pafos FC

### Participants
- **Football:**
  - 12 clubs
  - **5** senior clubs
  - **5** teams
  - **2** teams

### Insights
- Due to the mild climate condition, clubs rely almost exclusively on the use of natural grass pitches with only two clubs having artificial grass pitches in place.
- Eight highest percentage of club-owned training facilities across Europe.
- Ten of the twelve clubs are located in the three biggest cities of the island: Nicosia, Limassol and Larnaca.
CZECH REPUBLIC

GENERAL
- 16 clubs
- Facilities usage:
  - 22% Primary
  - 27% Secondary
  - Average age of facilities: 20.4 years

OWNERSHIP
- 32% football club
- 9% private owner
- 5% municipal
- 5% government
- 5% other

FACILITIES
- 3.1 natural grass pitches
- 2.0 artificial grass pitches
- 69% indoor training
- 75% fitness equipment

USAGE
- 13% sharing facilities
- 5% solely used by men's 1st team
- 81% women's team usage
- 25% youth team usage

INVESTMENT
- 44% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- Average spent per refurbishment: €0.6M

YOUTH BUDGET
- €0.5-1.0M

YOUTH PERSONNEL
- Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 0.1 FTE
  - Medical: 0.1 FTE
  - Education: 0.1 FTE
  - Coaching: 4 FTE

INSIGHTS
- All 16 clubs use technical tracking devices (based on GPS) during training activities.
- Ranks 8th in terms of average number of natural grass pitches per club.
- 64% of the facilities are used by the women's and men's sections at the same time, this is the fourth highest percentage Europe-wide.

PARTICIPATING CLUBS

KEY INFO
- Population: 10,606,000
- Top division revenue: €81m
- Top division clubs: 16
- Participating clubs:
  - AC Sparta Praha
  - FC Slovan Liberec
  - FK Dukla Praha
  - FK Mladá Boleslav
  - SK Sigma Olomouc
  - SK Slavia Praha
  - 1. FC Slovácko
  - 1. FK Příbram
  - Bohemians Praha 1905
  - FC Baník Ostrava
  - FC Viktoria Plzeň
  - FC Zlín
  - FK Jablonec
  - FK Teplice
  - MFK Karvina
  - SFC Opava

Note: one facility / •• two facilities
DENMARK

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

12% FOOTBALL CLUB
6% PRIVATE OWNER
50% MUNICIPAL
24% GOVERNMENT
0% OTHER

FACILITIES

6.4 NATURAL GRASS PITCHES
5.4 ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES
57% INDOOR TRAINING
93% FITNESS EQUIPMENT

USAGE

57% SHARING FACILITIES
6% SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM

79% MEDICAL TRACKING
93% TECHNICAL TRACKING
100% COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.
71% YOUTH BOARDING

INVESTMENT

100% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
€1.4M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

1 3 3
60% New pitches
13% General infrastructure improvements
20% Full refurbishment
7% New pitches

INSIGHTS

Highest number of pitches across the board. On average a Danish club have a total of just under 12 pitches available to them.
Fourth highest share of top division clubs with youth boarding facilities in place.
All top division clubs have collaborations with educational institutes in place.

PARTICIPATING CLUBS

FC Midtjylland ••
Odense BK ••
Vejle BK ••
Aalborg BK
AC Horsens
AGF Aarhus
Brøndby IF
Esbjerg fB
FC København
FC Nordsjælland
Hobro IK
Randers FC
SønderjyskE
Vendsyssel FF

KEY INFO

POPULATION: 5,825,000
FREE TO AIR REVENUE: €186m
TOP DIVISION CLUBS: 14
PARTICIPATING CLUBS: FC Midtjylland ••
Odense BK ••
Vejle BK ••
Aalborg BK
AC Horsens
AGF Aarhus
Brøndby IF
Esbjerg fB
FC København
FC Nordsjælland
Hobro IK
Randers FC
SønderjyskE
Vendsyssel FF

82% Primary
18% Secondary

12% FOOTBALL CLUB
6% PRIVATE OWNER
50% MUNICIPAL
24% GOVERNMENT
0% OTHER

6% PRIVATE FUNDING
12% CONTRIBUTIONS MUNICIPAL/ STATE
12% CONTRIBUTIONS LEAGUE/ NA
72% SENIOR CLUB FUNDING
5% UEFA SOLIDARITY PAYMENTS
6% CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PARENTS/ MEMBERSHIP

1.0-2.0M TYPICAL BUDGET

71% CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PARENTS/ MEMBERSHIP
93% CONTRIBUTIONS FROM LEAGUE/ NA
36% CONTRIBUTIONS MUNICIPAL/ STATE
5% CONTRIBUTIONS FROM LEAGUE/ NA
4% UEFA SOLIDARITY PAYMENTS
6% PRIVATE FUNDING
12% CONTRIBUTIONS MUNICIPAL/ STATE

BACK TO MENU
ENGLAND
ESTONIA

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

- 17% FOOTBALL CLUB
- 0% PRIVATE OWNER
- 83% MUNICIPAL
- 0% GOVERNMENT
- 0% OTHER

FACILITIES

- 1.0 NATURAL GRASS PITCHES
- 1.3 ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES
- 40% INDOOR TRAINING
- 30% FITNESS EQUIPMENT

USAGE

- 90% SHARING FACILITIES
- 17% SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM
- 90% WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE
- 100% YOUTH TEAM USAGE

INVESTMENT

- 90% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

INVESTMENT

- €1.8M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

INVESTMENT

- 50% New pitches
- 13% New facility
- 10% Stadium infrastructure
- 6% Match venues
- 13% Operations/administration

YOUTH BUDGET

- €0-0.5M TYPICAL BUDGET

YOUTH PERSONNEL

AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:

- Organization/logistics: 1.2 FTE
- Medical: 1.2 FTE
- Education: 0.3 FTE
- Coaching: 0.10 FTE
- Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

KEY INFO

POPULATION: 1,319,000
TOP DIVISION REVENUE: €8m
TOP DIVISION CLUBS: 10

PARTICIPATING CLUBS:
- FC Flora Tallinn ••
- FC Kuressaare ••
- JK Tallinna Kalev ••
- JK Tammeka Tartu ••
- JK Tulevik Viljandi ••
- Maardu Linnameeskond ••
- Nõmme Kalju FC ••
- Paide Linnameeskond ••
- FC Levadia Tallinn
- JK Narva Trans

INSIGHTS

All facilities are used by youth teams, yet only one offers youth boarding options.

One of the few countries where membership fees and parent support is the single largest contributor to youth development programme.

Only country in the Baltics reported a club had a youth budget of more than €500k.
**FAROE ISLANDS**

**GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWNERSHIP**

- 0% FOOTBALL CLUB
- 0% PRIVATE OWNER
- 100% MUNICIPAL
- 0% GOVERNMENT
- 0% OTHER

**FACILITIES**

- 0% NATURAL GRASS PITCHES
- 1.5% ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES
- 100% INDOOR TRAINING
- 100% FITNESS EQUIPMENT

**USAGE**

- 20% SHARING FACILITIES
- 0% SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM
- 50% WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE
- 100% YOUTH TEAM USAGE

**INVESTMENT**

- 100% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
- €1.2M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

**INVESTMENT OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Budget (€M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New pitches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3-0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>€0.5-2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>€2.5M+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUTH PERSONNEL**

**Origin of funding**

- 23% Senior club funding
- 54% Private funding
- 8% UEFA solidarity payments
- 15% Contributions local/ state
- 0% Contributions membership parents

**Average full time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:**

- 0-1 FTE: Organisation/logistics
- 0-1 FTE: Medical
- 0-1 FTE: Education
- 1-2 FTE: Coaching
- 0-1 FTE: Scouting/analysis

**KEY INFO**

- POPULATION: 51,000
- TOP DIVISION REVENUE: €7m
- TOP DIVISION CLUBS: 10

**PARTICIPATING CLUBS**

- B36 Tórshavn
- EB/Streymur
- HB Tórshavn
- Vikingur
- ÓF Vantorvik
- AB Argir
- KÍ Klaksvík
- NSÍ Runavík
- Skála ÍF
- TB Tvøroyri

*One facility / •• two facilities

**INSIGHTS**

- Only country where clubs rely exclusively on the use of artificial pitches
- Due to the adverse weather conditions, all clubs have indoor football training possibilities at their training centres
- All clubs train in the immediate vicinity of their own stadium

*Clubs in the Faroe Islands did not provide information related to the breakdown of youth development budget financing.
FRANCE

**General**
- **20** clubs have facilities
- **17** facilities are average age of facilities

**Ownership**
- **47%** football club
- **12%** private owner
- **35%** municipal
- **6%** government
- **0%** other

**Facilities**
- **3.7** natural grass pitches
- **3.2** artificial grass pitches
- **8%** indoor training
- **77%** fitness equipment

**Usage**
- **8%** sharing facilities
- **12%** solely used by men's 1st team
- **46%** women's team usage
- **85%** youth team usage

**Usage**

**Investment**
- **92%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€2.2M** average spent per refurbishment

**Youth Budget**
- **€4.0-5.0M** typical budget

**Origin of Funding**
- **72%** senior club funding
- **1%** private funding
- **2%** UEFA solidarity payments
- **15%** contributions league/NA
- **15%** contributions municipal/state
- **0%** contributions membership/parents

**Insights**
- Eleven clubs have youth boarding facilities for more than 25 players in place, trailing only Turkey in this category.
- The typical club has a youth development budget of €4m-€5m which is trails only Germany and England.
- One of four countries with a broad national representation of no two clubs based in the same town or city.
Georgian football landscape 2020

**General**

- **Clubs**: 10
- **Facilities**: 18
- **Average age of facilities**: 12.6 years

**Ownership**

- 12% football club
- 6% private owner
- 65% municipal
- 6% government
- 12% other

**Facilities**

- **Natural grass pitches**: 1.5
- **Artificial grass pitches**: 1.4
- **Indoor training**: 0%
- **Fitness equipment**: 50%

**Usage**

- **Sharing facilities**: 40%
- **Solely used by men’s 1st team**: 22%
- **Women’s team usage**: 0%
- **Youth team usage**: 90%

**Investment**

- **70%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€1.9M** average spent per refurbishment

**Youth budget**

- **Typical budget**: €0-0.5M
- **Origin of funding**
  - 5% senior club funding
  - 14% private funding
  - 34% UEFA solidarity payments
  - 5% contributions municipal/state
  - 27% contributions membership/parents

**Labour**

- **Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to**
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 1.0 FTE
  - Education: 1.0 FTE
  - Coaching: 4.0 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 1.2 FTE

**Insights**

- Eight out of ten clubs use more than one training facility.
- National football association provided technical tracking tools to the top two divisions explaining their high usage in this category.
- One in eight countries where none of the clubs operates an indoor training facility.

**Key Info**

- **Population**: 3,693,000
- **Top division revenue**: €12m
- **Top division clubs**: 10
  - FC Chikhura Sachkhere
  - FC Dila Gori
  - FC Dinamo Tbilisi
  - FC Lokomotivi Tbilisi
  - FC Metalurgi Rustavi
  - FC Saburtalo Tbilisi
  - FC Samtredia
  - FC Sioni Bolnisi
  - FC Kolkheti Poti
  - FC Torpedo Kutaisi

- **Participating clubs**
  - One facility / two facilities
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

- 21% Football Club
- 21% Private Owner
- 37% Municipal
- 0% Government
- 21% Other

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Grass Pitches</th>
<th>Artificial Grass Pitches</th>
<th>Indoor Training</th>
<th>Fitness Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Usage

- 7% Sharing Facilities
- 11% Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team
- 14% Women’s Team Usage
- 64% Youth Team Usage

### Investment

- 79% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.3M Average spent per refurbishment

### Youth Budget

- €0.5-1.0M

### Youth Personnel

- Averange Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Dedicated To:
  - Organisation/logistics: 3 FTE
  - Medical: 3 FTE
  - Education: 1-2 FTE
  - Coaching: 5-7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 1-2 FTE

### Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asteras Tripolis FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levadiakos FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS Giannina FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEK Athens FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aris Thessaloniki FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atromitos FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFI Crete FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympiacos FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAOK FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthi FC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panetolikos F.C. and Volos FC did not provide information for this questionnaire.
HUNGARY

GENERAL

- **CLUBS**: 12
- **FACILITIES**: 16
- **AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES**: 14.9

OWNERSHIP

- **19%**: FOOTBALL CLUB
- **6%**: PRIVATE OWNER
- **31%**: MUNICIPAL
- **38%**: GOVERNMENT
- **6%**: OTHER

FACILITIES

- **3.9** NATURAL GRASS PITCHES
- **1.7** ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES
- **42%** INDOOR TRAINING
- **83%** FITNESS EQUIPMENT
- **58%** MEDICAL TRACKING
- **92%** TECHNICAL TRACKING
- **25%** COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.
- **50%** YOUTH BOARDING

USAGE

- **25%** SHARING FACILITIES
- **0%** SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM
- **58%** WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE
- **92%** YOUTH TEAM USAGE

INVESTMENT

- **100%** OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
- **€7.2M** AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT
- **1** n.a. / repairs only
- **4** €0.5-5M
- **1** €0.5-2M
- **1** €2-5M
- **5** >€5M

INVESTMENTS

- **8%** New pitches
- **46%** Stadium infrastructure
- **15%** New facility
- **31%** New pitches

YOUTH BUDGET

- **€1.0-2.0M** TYPICAL BUDGET

ORIGIN OF FUNDING

- **16%**: Senior club funding
- **20%**: Private funding
- **5%**: UEFA solidarity payments
- **25%**: Contributions league / NA
- **10%**: Contributions municipal / state
- **1%**: Contributions membership / parents

YOUTH PERSONNEL

- **AVERAGE FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:**
  - Organisation/logistics: 4 FTE
  - Medical: 4 FTE
  - Education: 3 FTE
  - Coaching: 15-15 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 4 FTE

KEY INFO

- **POPULATION**: 9,758,000
- **TOP DIVISION REVENUE**: €134m
- **TOP DIVISION CLUBS**: 12
  - Debreceni VSC
  - Ferencvárosi TC
  - Mezőkövesdi-Zsóry SE
  - MTK Budapest
  - Budapest Honved FC
  - Diósgyőri VTK
  - Kisvárda FC
  - MOL Fehérvár FC
  - Paksı FC
  - Puskás Akadémia FC
  - Szombathelyi Haladás
  - Újpest FC

INSIGHTS

- On average, clubs invested €7.2 million in their training facilities in the last five years, the highest average in Europe.
- Almost a third of surveyed facilities have been inaugurated less than 5 years ago.
- No facility is used only by one of the clubs’ men’s first team.

BACK TO MENU
ICELAND

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

- 17% Football Club
- 6% Private Owner
- 56% Municipal
- 22% Government
- 5% Other

FACILITIES

- 2.5 Natural Grass Pitches
- 2.7 Artificial Grass Pitches
- 82% Indoor Training
- 100% Fitness Equipment

USAGE

- 91% Sharing Facilities
- 0% Solely Used by Men's 1st Team
- 100% Women's Team Usage
- 100% Youth Team Usage

INVESTMENT

- 100% of Clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €1.5M Average spent per refurbishment

YOUTH BUDGET

- €0.5-1.0M Typical budget

INVESTMENT

- 100% of Clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €1.5M Average spent per refurbishment

YOUTH PERSONNEL

- Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisational/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 0.1 FTE
  - Education: 0.3 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

INSIGHTS

- Only country where all the training facilities are shared with the women's team of the club
- Due to the adverse weather conditions, 82% of clubs have indoor football training facilities at their training centres. This is the 3rd highest ratio in Europe.
- Top division football is heavily located in the southwestern part of the country with 10/11 clubs originating from the nearby Reykjavik region.

KEY INFO

- Population: 357,000
- Top Division Revenue: €22m
- Top Division Clubs: 12
  - Participating Clubs:
    - Breidablik ••
    - FH Hafnarfjördur ••
    - Fjölnir ••
    - Fylkir ••
    - KA Akureyri ••
    - Keflavík ••
    - KR Reykjavík ••
    - Valur Reykjavík ••
    - Grindavík
    - Stjarnan
    - Víkingur Reykjavík

ÍBV Vestmannaeyjar did not provide information for this questionnaire.
## Israel

### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

- 5% Football Club
- 10% Private Owner
- 30% Municipal
- 5% Government
- 10% Other

### Facilities

| Type                  | Percentage | Usage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Grass Pitches</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Usage

- 23% Sharing Facilities
- 10% Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team
- 23% Women’s Team Usage
- 92% Youth Team Usage

### Investment

- 85% of clubs have refurbished their facilities
- €0.7M average spent per refurbishment

### Youth Budget

- €1.0-2.0M typical budget

### Youth Personnel

- Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 4 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 1.2 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 1.2 FTE

### Insights

- One of five countries where club youth budgets range from less than €500k to more than €5 million
- Shared second highest number of shared stadiums between top division clubs in Europe
- Hapoel Beer-Sheva FC reported the most Southern training facility across all participating clubs

### Participating Clubs

- FC Ashdod
- Hapoel Hadera FC
- Hapoel Haifa FC
- Hapoel Ra'anana FC
- Maccabi Haifa FC
- Maccabi Netanya FC
- Maccabi Tel-Aviv FC
- Beitar Jerusalem FC
- Bnei Yehuda Tel-Aviv FC
- Hapoel Beer-Sheva FC
- Hapoel Kiryat Saba FC
- Hapoel Kiryat Shmona FC
- Hapoel Tel-Aviv FC

---

Sektzia Nes Tziona F.C. did not provide information for this questionnaire.
ITALY

GENERAL

- 20 CLUBS
- 31 FACILITIES
- 18.4 AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES

OWNERSHIP

- 23% FOOTBALL CLUB
- 19% PRIVATE OWNER
- 39% MUNICIPAL
- 0% GOVERNMENT
- 19% OTHER

FACILITIES

- 3.0 NATURAL GRASS Pitches
- 2.7 ARTIFICIAL GRASS Pitches
- 30% INDOOR TRAINING
- 100% FITNESS EQUIPMENT

USAGE

- 55% SHARING FACILITIES
- 6% SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM
- 15% WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE
- 95% YOUTH TEAM USAGE

INVESTMENT

- 90% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
- €3.3M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

INVESTMENT OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

- €0.5-2M 19%
- €2-5M 38%
- >€5M 29%

INVESTMENT FOR GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

- AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

- 90%

- one facility / •• two facilities

INSIGHTS

- On average, top division clubs employ 5-7 FTE for non-coaching youth development matters. This is the highest in Europe
- 31 different training facilities were reported to be used by top division clubs, the highest number in Europe
- Only one of two top divisions with multiple top division teams in four different cities

YOUTH BUDGET

- €4.0-5.0M TYPICAL BUDGET

ORIGIN OF FUNDING

- 61% Senior club funding
- 10% Private funding
- 8% UEFA solidarity payments
- 8% Contributions from club/ NA
- 1% Contributions from municipal/ state
- 3% Contributions from membership/sponsors/ other

AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:

- Organisation/logistics: 8-10 FTE
- Medical: 8-10 FTE
- Education: 4 FTE
- Coaching: 16-20 FTE
- Scouting/ analysis: 5-7 FTE

KEY INFO

- POPULATION: 60,740,000
- TOP DIVISION REVENUE: €2,307m
- TOP DIVISION CLUBS: 20
- PARTICIPATING CLUBS: AC Milan ••
  ACF Fiorentina ••
  FC Internazionale Milano ••
  Genoa CFC ••
  Juventus ••
  Parma FC ••
  Spal ••
  SSC Napoli ••
  Torino FC ••
  UC Sampdoria ••
  Udinese Calcio ••
  AS Roma
  Atalanta BC
  Bologna FC
  Brescia Calcio
  Cagliari Calcio
  Hellas Verona FC
  SS Lazio
  US Lecce
  US Sassuolo Calcio

- one facility / •• two facilities

BACK TO MENU
**GENERAL**

- **12** clubs
- **19** facilities
- **15.1** average age of facilities

**OWNERSHIP**

- 11% football club
- 16% private owner
- 37% municipal
- 16% government
- 18% other

**FACILITIES**

- **0.6** natural grass pitches
- **1.8** artificial grass pitches
- **58%** indoor training
- **83%** fitness equipment
- **58%** medical tracking
- **67%** technical tracking
- **83%** collaboration with edu. inst.
- **33%** youth boarding

**INVESTMENT**

- **58%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€0.3M** average spent per refurbishment

**INVESTMENT DETAILS**

- **40%** new pitches
- **40%** general infrastructure improvements
- **20%** stadium infrastructure

**YOUTH BUDGET**

- **€0-0.5M**

**ORGAN OF FUNDING**

- 23% senior club funding
- 16% private funding
- 14% UEFA solidarity payments
- 5% contributions league/NA
- 6% contributions municipal/state
- 26% contributions membership/parents

**YOUTH PERSONNEL**

- **1.8** FTE
- **58%** organisational/logistics
- **42%** medical
- **17%** education
- **23%** coaching
- **16%** scouting/analysis

---

**INSIGHTS**

Clubs dedicate typically 16-20 FTE to coaching of youth teams. This range is the shared highest value across Europe.

Youth development budgets are financed largely by contributions from municipality’s and state authorities (62%). This is the highest value for this category in Europe.

FC Zhetysu Taldykorgan reported the most Eastern training facility across all participating clubs.

**PARTICIPATING CLUBS**

- FC Akzhayik Uralsk
- FC Astana
- FC Atyrau
- FC Irtysh Pavlodar
- FC Kairat Almaty
- FC Ordabasy Shymkent
- FC Shakhter Karagandy
- FC Akbar
- FC Kaspiy Kyzylorda
- FC Kyzylzhar Petropavl
- FC Tobol Kostanay
- FC Zhetysu Taldykorgan

---

**KEY INFO**

- **POPULATION:** 18,737,000
- **TOP DIVISION REVENUE:** €121m
- **TOP DIVISION CLUBS:** 12
Kosovo

**General**

- Clubs: 12
- Facilities: 14
- Average age of facilities: 29.1

**Ownership**

- 7% Football club
- 0% Private owner
- 87% Municipal
- 0% Government
- 7% Other

**Facilities**

- Medical tracking: 0%
- Technical tracking: 0%
- Collaboration with EDU. inst.: 0%
- Youth boarding: 0%
- Indoor training: 25%
- Fitness equipment usage: 0%
- Natural grass pitches: 0.8
- Artificial grass pitches: 0.6
- New pitches: 33%
- Full refurbishment: 33%
- Stadium infrastructure: 33%

**Usage**

- Sharing facilities: 42%
- Soley used by men’s 1st team: 7%
- Women’s team usage: 17%
- Youth team usage: 83%

**Investment**

- 58% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- Average spent per refurbishment: n.a. / repairs only
  - €0-0.5M: 33%
  - €0.5-2M: 33%
  - €2-5M: 33%
  - >€5M: 0%

**Youth Budget**

- Typical budget: €0-0.5M
- Contributions league/NA: 0%
- Contributions municipal/state: 0%
- Contributions membership/parents: 0%
- Senior club funding: 0%
- UEFA solidarity payments: 0%
- Contributions league/NA: 0%

**Youth Personnel**

- Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 0.3 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

**Insights**

- Just under 75% of the youth development budgets are financed by contributions from membership fees and parental contributions.
- One club only gets the benefit of a facility with more than 1 full-size pitch.
- No facility is equipped yet with either medical or technical tracking devices.

**Key Info**

- Population: 1,908,000
- Top Division Revenue: €4m
- Top Division Clubs: 12
- Participating Clubs:
  - Feronikeli ••
  - KF Drita ••
  - KF Gjilani ••
  - KF Trepça ’89 ••
  - FC KEK-u
  - FC Prishtina
  - Flamurtari/Prishtina
  - KF Ballkani
  - KF Drenica
  - KF Ferizaj
  - KF Liria
  - KF Llapi

- One facility / two facilities
## Latvia

### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

- 7% Football Club
- 0% Private Club
- 87% Municipal
- 7% Government

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Tracking</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Tracking</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Edu. Inst.</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Boarding</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Grass Pitches</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment

- 38% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.1M average spent per refurbishment

### Youth Budget

- €0-0.5M

### Youth Personnel

- Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 0.1 FTE
  - Coaching: 1.15 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

### Insights

- One of only six countries where more than three quarters of the participants have indoor football facilities at the facility, they use.
- No facility is used solely by one of the clubs' men's first team.
- Seven out of eight clubs have secondary training facilities in place.

### Participating Clubs

- FK Jelgava
- FK Ventspils
- FS Metta
- RF FC
- Bīržai Futsal Skola
- SK Liepājas Metalurgs
- Valmiera Glass
- FK Spartaks Jūrmala

### Key Info

- Population: 1,929,000
- Top Division Revenue: €5m
- Top Division Clubs: 9
- Participating Clubs: FK Jelgava, FK Ventspils, FS Metta, RF FC, Bīržai Futsal Skola, SK Liepājas Metalurgs, Valmiera Glass, FK Spartaks Jūrmala
- One club, FK Spartaks Jūrmala, has one facility, while the other seven clubs have two facilities.

### Investment of Clubs that Have Refurbished Their Facilities

- €0.1M average spent per refurbishment
- 7% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
LUXEMBOURG

GENERAL
- CLUBS: 14
- FACILITIES: 22
- AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES: 42.7

OWNERSHIP
- 64% PRIMARY
- 36% SECONDARY
- 0% MUNICIPAL
- 0% OTHER

FACILITIES
- NATURAL GRASS PITCHES: 1.9
- ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES: 1.5
- INDOOR TRAINING: 0%
- FITNESS EQUIPMENT: 50%

USAGE
- MEDICAL TRACKING: 0%
- TECHNICAL TRACKING: 0%
- COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.: 50%
- YOUTH BOARDING: 0%

INVESTMENT
- 86% OF CLUBS HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
- AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT: €0.4M

INSIGHTS
- One of only two countries in Europe where clubs declare they don't share their facilities in any way
- One of only three countries were all training facilities are owned by municipalities
- One of the highest percentages in Europe of facilities used only by clubs' men's first team

YOUTH BUDGET
- 24% SENIOR CLUB FUNDING
- 21% UEFA SOLIDARITY PAYMENTS
- 17% CONTRIBUTIONS LEAGUE/NA
- 27% CONTRIBUTIONS MUNICIPAL/STATE
- 1% PRIVATE FUNDING

YOUTH PERSONNEL
- AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:
  - ORGANISATION/LOGISTICS: 0.1 FTE
  - MEDICAL: 0.1 FTE
  - EDUCATION: 0.1 FTE
  - COACHING: 0.1 FTE
  - SCOUTING/ANALYSIS: 0.1 FTE

- CONTRIBUTIONS MUNICIPAL/STATE: 0%
- CONTRIBUTIONS LEAGUE/NA: 0%
- CONTRIBUTIONS MEMBERSHIP: 0%
- CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE SENIOR CLUB: 100%
- CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE FUNDING AGENCY: 24%
- CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE LEAGUE: 0%

KEY INFO
- POPULATION: 617,000
- TOP DIVISION REVENUE: €17m
- TOP DIVISION CLUBS: 14
- PARTICIPATING CLUBS:
  - F91 Dudelange
  - FC Differdange 03
  - FC Etzella Ettelbruck
  - FC RM Hamm Benfica
  - FC UNA Strassen
  - US Hostert
  - US Mondorf-les-Bains
  - US Rumelange
  - AS Jeunesse Esch
  - CS Fola Esch
  - CS Pétange
  - FC Progrès Niederkorn
  - FC Victoria Rosport
  - Racing FC Union Lëtzebuerg

- 64% PRIMARY
- 36% SECONDARY

BACK TO MENU
Malta

### General
- **Clubs**: 14
- **Facilities**: 20
- **Average Age of Facilities**: 21.1 years

### Ownership
- **75% Football Club**
- **0% Private Owner**
- **0% Municipal**
- **0% Government**
- **25% Other**

### Facilities
- **Medical Tracking**: 64%
- **Technical Tracking**: 0%
- **Collaboration with Edu. Inst.**: 0%
- **Youth Boarding**: 64%
- **Indoor Training**: 0%
- **Fitness Equipment**: 0%
- **Artificial Grass Pitches**: 0.9
- **Natural Grass Pitches**: 0.1

### Usage
- **Sharing Facilities**: 21%
- **Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team**: 86%
- **Women’s Team Usage**: 21%
- **Youth Team Usage**: 86%

### Investment
- **86% of Clubs that have refurbished their facilities**
- **Average Spent per Refurbishment**: €0.3M
- **Full Refurbishment**: 54%
- **New Pitches**: 23%
- **General Infrastructure Improvements**: 15%
- **Repairs Only**: 8%

### Youth Budget
- **Typical Budget**: €0-0.5M
- **Contributions membership/parents**: 86%
- **Contributions league/NA**: 0%
- **Contributions municipal/state**: 0%
- **Senior club funding**: 4%
- **UEFA solidarity payments**: 34%
- **Organisation/Logistics**: 3 FTE
- **Medical**: 0 FTE
- **Education**: 0 FTE
- **Coaching**: 3 FTE
- **Scouting/Analysis**: 0 FTE

### Insights
- Only two clubs reported to have full size natural grass pitches at their training facility with the majority of clubs relying on artificial grass pitches.
- Just over a quarter of the youth budgets are financed by private funding. Nowhere is this percentage higher than Malta.
- One of five countries where all clubs share their facilities with another football club.

### Participating Clubs
- Balzan FC
- Birkirkara FC
- Floriana FC
- Gzira United FC
- Hibernians FC
- Valletta FC
- Gudja United FC
- Hamrun Spartans FC
- Mosta FC
- Santa Lucia FC
- Senglea Athletic FC
- Sirens FC
- Sliema Wanderers FC
- Tarxien Rainbows FC

### Key Info
- **Population**: 473,000
- **Top Division Revenue**: €7m
- **Top Division Clubs**: 14

---

Note: The details provided are a summary of the content visible in the image. For a comprehensive understanding, please refer to the original document.
MOLDOVA

**GENERAL**
- **CLUBS**: 8
- **FACILITIES**: 11
- **AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES**: 12.5

**OWNERSHIP**
- **FOOTBALL CLUB**: 9%
- **PRIVATE CLUB**: 9%
- **MUNICIPAL**: 55%
- **GOVERNMENT**: 9%
- **OTHER**: 18%

**FACILITIES**
- **NATURAL GRASS PITCHES**: 2.0
- **ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES**: 1.9
- **INDOOR TRAINING**: 25%
- **FITNESS EQUIPMENT**: 50%
- **MEDICAL TRACKING**: 38%
- **TECHNICAL TRACKING**: 38%
- **COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.**: 38%
- **YOUTH BOARDING**: 13%

**INVESTMENT**
- **50% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES**
- **€0.2M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT**

**USAGE**
- **50% SHARING FACILITIES**
- **18% SOLELY USED BY MEN'S 1ST TEAM**
- **13% WOMEN'S TEAM USAGE**
- **75% YOUTH TEAM USAGE**

**INVESTMENT OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES**
- **€0.2M**
- **€0.5M**
- **€2.5M**
- **>€5M**

**YOUTH BUDGET**
- **€0-0.5M**

**ORIGIN OF FUNDING**
- **Sponsorship**
- **Private funding**
- **UEFA solidarity payments**
- **Contributions league/NA**
- **Contributions municipal/state**
- **Contributions membership/parents**

**YOUTH PERSONNEL**
- **AVERAGE FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:**
  - **ORGANISATION/LOGISTICS**: 3 FTE
  - **MEDICAL**: 1.2 FTE
  - **EDUCATION**: 1.2 FTE
  - **COACHING**: 5.7 FTE
  - **SCOUTING/ANALYSIS**: 0.1 FTE

**KEY INFO**
- **POPULATION**: 3,542,000
- **TOP DIVISION REVENUE**: €7m
- **TOP DIVISION CLUBS**: 8
- **PARTICIPATING CLUBS**
  - CS Petrocub
  - FC Milsami Orhei
  - FC Speranta Nisporeni
  - FC Dinamo-Auto Tiraspol
  - FC Sfintul Gheorghe Suruceni
  - FC Sheriff
  - FC Zaria Balti
  - FC Zimbru Chisinau

**INSIGHTS**
- One of four countries where all clubs share at least one facility
- One of only four countries where no club reported a single significant investment of more than €500,000
- One of only eight countries where a city other than the capital (Tiraspol) has the highest number of top division teams
Montenegro

General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership

- 8% Football Club
- 0% Private Owner
- 83% Municipal
- 8% Government
- 0% Other

Facilities

- 1.3 Natural Grass Pitches
- 1.4 Artificial Grass Pitches
- 25% Indoor Training
- 50% Fitness Equipment

Usage

- 75% Sharing Facilities
- 0% Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team
- 13% Women’s Team Usage
- 100% Youth Team Usage

Investment

- 63% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.3M average spent per refurbishment

Youth Budget

- €0.0-0.5M typical budget

Youth Personnel

- Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 1.2 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

Insights

- Just over a quarter of youth development budgets are financed by grants or subsidies from the league or national association.
- Nowhere is this higher than in Top division clubs, which reported more artificial than natural grass pitches at their training facilities.
- No single youth development funding category makes up for more than 30%, illustrating a balanced picture.

Key Info

- Population: 625,000
- Top Division Revenue: €5m
- Top Division Clubs: 10

Participating Clubs

- FK Zeta
- OFK Gornji Milanovac
- OFK Petrovac
- OFK Titograd
- OFK Vranje
- OFK Vranje
- OFK Vranje
- OFK Vranje
- OFK Vranje
- OFK Vranje

1.4 25% 50% 1.3
0% 13% 75% 13% 100%

Contributions membership/parents
Private funding
Contributions league/NA
Senior club funding
UEFA solidarity payments

3 4 1
0.1 0.5-2M 2-5M >5M

New pitches
Full refurbishment

FK Iskra Danilovgrad and FK Mornar did not provide information for this questionnaire.
NETHERLANDS

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

- 40% Football Club
- 0% Private Owner
- 28% Municipal
- 24% Government
- 8% Other

FACILITIES

- 3.9 Natural Grass Pitches
- 3.4 Artificial Grass Pitches
- 12% Indoor Training
- 100% Fitness Equipment

MEDICAL TRACKING: 82%
TECHNICAL TRACKING: 94%
COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.: 94%
YOUTH BOARDING: 24%

INVESTMENT

- 82% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €2.9M average spent per refurbishment

INVESTMENT OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

- €0-0.5M: 5
- €0.5-2M: 6
- €2.5M+: 4

- New pitches: 28%
- New facilities: 17%
- General infrastructure improvements: 50%
- Fabrication/repairs: 6%
- Miscellaneous: 1%

YOUTH BUDGET

- €1.0-2.0M

TYPICAL BUDGET

- Contributions membership/parents: 76%
- Private funding: 6%
- UEFA solidarity payments: 7%
- Contributions league/NA: 8%
- Contributions municipal/state: 8%
- External transfers: 0%

AFC Ajax did not provide information for this questionnaire.

INSIGHTS

- Highest number of artificial/hybrid grass pitches across Europe.
- On average, clubs have a total of just over 3 artificial pitches to his availability.
- Just over three quarters (76%) of the typical youth budget of is funded by the parent club. This value trails only Germany.
- One of the few countries where a city other than the capital (Rotterdam) has the highest number of top division teams.

KEY INFO

- Population: 17,240,000
- Top Division Revenue: €497m
- Top Division Clubs: 18
- Participating Clubs:
  - FC Twente
  - Heracles Almelo
  - NAC Breda
  - PEC Zwolle
  - Roda JC
  - SBV Excelsior
  - Sparta Rotterdam
  - VVV-Venlo
  - ADO Den Haag
  - AZ Alkmaar
  - FC Groningen
  - FC Utrecht
  - Feyenoord
  - PSV Eindhoven
  - SC Heerenveen
  - Vitesse
  - Willem II

One facility / Two facilities
## General
- **Clubs:** 10
- **Facilities:** 18
- **Average age of facilities:** 18.1

### Ownership
- 20% **Football club**
- 15% **Private owner**
- 65% **Municipal**
- 0% **Government**
- 0% **Other**

### Facilities
- **Medical tracking:** 70%
- **Technical tracking:** 70%
- **Collaboration with edu. inst.:** 70%
- **Youth boarding:** 20%

### Usage
- **Indoor training:** 60%
- **Fitness equipment usage:** 6%
- **Sharing facilities:** 0%
- **Women’s team usage:** 100%
- **Youth team usage:** 0%

### Investment
- 60% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **Average spent per refurbishment:** €0.9M

### Youth Budget
- **Typical budget:** €0.5M

### Origin of Funding
- **6%** - Contributions membership/parents
- **14%** - Private funding
- **25%** - UEFA solidarity payments
- **25%** - Contributions leaguem/sponsor
- **14%** - Contributions municipal/state
- **14%** - Contributions membership/parents

### Youths Personnel
- **Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:**
  - Organisation/logistics: 4 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 0.5 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

### Insights
- All clubs reported to have a secondary training facility in place.
- FK Akademija Pandev AD and FK Belasica GC have the closest non-shared training facilities across Europe.
- More than half the top division clubs originate from Skopje and Strumica.
NORTHERN IRELAND

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

- 24% FOOTBALL CLUB
- 12% PRIVATE OWNER
- 35% MUNICIPAL
- 0% GOVERNMENT
- 29% OTHER

FACILITIES

- 1.7 NATURAL GRASS PITCHES
- 1.6 ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES
- 42% INDOOR TRAINING
- 58% FITNESS EQUIPMENT

MEDICAL TRACKING 25%
TECHNICAL TRACKING 25%
COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST. 25%
YOUTH BOARDING 0%

INVESTMENT

- 83% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES
- €1.5M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

INVESTMENT OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

- 8% New pitches
- 8% Full refurbishment
- 8% General infrastructure improvements
- 15% New facility

YOUTH BUDGET

- €0.0-0.5M TYPICAL BUDGET
- 27% Senior club funding
- 0% Private funding
- 51% UEFA solidarity payments
- 1% Contributions leagues/NA
- 0% Contributions municipal/state
- 12% Contributions membership/parents

YOUTH PERSONNEL

- AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:
  - Organisation/logistics 0.1 FTE
  - Medical 0.1 FTE
  - Education 0.1 FTE
  - Coaching 0.1 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis 0.1 FTE

INSIGHTS

- Sixth highest percentage of club-owned training facilities across Europe
- UEFA Solidarity payments fund more than half of the youth development budgets.
- This is the fifth highest share
- The Brandywell Stadium in Derry is the only stadium that is used by a club from two different countries, including Institute F.C.
**Norway**

### General
- **Clubs**: 16
- **Facilities**: 26
- **Average Age of Facilities**: 34.2

### Ownership
- **31%**: Football Club
- **8%**: Private Owner
- **42%**: Municipal
- **15%**: Government
- **0%**: Other

### Facilities
- **Natural Grass Pitches**: 0.9
- **Artificial Grass Pitches**: 2.4
- **Indoor Training**: 75%
- **Fitness Equipment**: 94%

### Usage
- **Sharing Facilities**: 63%
- **Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team**: 4%

### Facilities Refurbishment
- **81%** of clubs have refurbished their facilities
- **AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT**: €0.7M

### Youth Budget
- **Typical Budget**: €0.5-1.0M

### Origin of Funding
- **41%**: Senior club funding
- **11%**: Private funding
- **13%**: UEFA solidarity payments
- **24%**: Contributions leagues/SA
- **2%**: Contributions municipal/State
- **5%**: Contributions membership/parents

### Youth Personnel
- **Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE)**
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 0.5 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

### Insights
- Clubs rely heavily on artificial pitches averaging just under one natural grass pitch vs. almost two and a half artificial grass pitches.
- Reported the second highest absolute number of indoor training facilities.
- Tromsø IL reported the most Northern training facility across all participating clubs.
**Poland**

**General**

- **16** clubs
- **25** facilities
- **28.8** average age of facilities

**Ownership**

- **16%** football club
- **8%** private owner
- **68%** municipal
- **8%** government
- **0%** other

**Facilities**

- **2.9** natural grass pitches
- **2.2** artificial grass pitches
- **50%** indoor training
- **88%** fitness equipment

**Usage**

- **63%** sharing facilities
- **4%** solely used by men’s 1st team
- **6%** women’s team usage
- **100%** youth team usage

**Investment**

- **63%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€0.5M** average spent per refurbishment

**Youth Budget**

- **€0.5-1.0M** typical budget

**Youth Personnel**

- **AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:**
  - Organisation/logistics: **3 FTE**
  - Medical: **3 FTE**
  - Education: **3 FTE**
  - Coaching: **11-15 FTE**
  - Scouting/analysis: **1-2 FTE**

**Insights**

- Reported the 9th highest average number of FTE’s dedicated to youth development.
- Ranks 11th across all participating countries in terms of average number of pitches per club.
- One of only eight countries where a city other than the capital (Kraków) has the highest number of top division teams.
### Portugal

#### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical tracking</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical tracking</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor training</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness equipment</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's team usage</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth team usage</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Investment

- **86%** of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€3.9M** average spent per refurbishment

#### Youth Budget

- **€1.0-2.0M** typical budget

#### Youth Personnel

- **AVERAGE FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:**
  - Organisation/logistics: 8.10 FTE
  - Medical: 15.15 FTE
  - Education: 4 FTE
  - Coaching: 11.15 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 5.7 FTE

#### Insights

- One of only two countries where all participating clubs reported to have fitness centre equipment and technical tracking in use at their training facilities.
- One of five countries where club youth budgets range from less than €500k to more than €5 million.
- More than half the participating clubs own their training facilities.
**Insights**

- All top division clubs have collaborations with educational institutes in place.
- Nowhere in Europe is the usage of training facilities owned by educational institutes higher than it is in the Republic of Ireland.
- The Brandywell Stadium in Derry is the only stadium that is used by a club from two different countries, including Derry City FC.

**Participating Clubs**

- Bohemian FC
- Cork City FC
- Dundalk FC
- Finn Harps FC
- Saint Patrick’s Athletic FC
- Sligo Rovers FC
- University College Dublin AFC
- Derry City FC
- Shamrock Rovers FC
- Waterford United FC

**Youth Budget**

- €0-0.5M

**Youth Personnel**

- Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organization/logistics: 0.1 FTE
  - Medical: 0.1 FTE
  - Education: 0.1 FTE
  - Coaching: 0.1 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

**Origin of Funding**

- 57% Senior club funding
- 4% Private funding
- 20% UEFA solidarity payments
- 7% Contributions leagues/NA
- 6% Contributions municipal/state
- 13% Contributions membership/parents

**Youth Budget**

- €0-0.5M

**Youth Personnel**

- Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organization/logistics: 0.1 FTE
  - Medical: 0.1 FTE
  - Education: 0.1 FTE
  - Coaching: 0.1 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

**Investment**

- 40% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €2.8M average spent per refurbishment

**Facilities**

- Natural grass pitches: 3.5
- Artificial grass pitches: 1.9
- Indoor training: 70%
- Fitness equipment: 90%

**Usage**

- 90% sharing facilities
- 12% solely used by men’s 1st team
- 20% women’s team usage
- 70% youth team usage

**Ownership**

- 6% football club
- 0% private owner
- 18% municipal
- 12% government
- 65% other
**GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWNERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Tracking</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Tracking</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Edu. Inst.</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Facilities</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely used by Men's 1st Team</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Team Usage</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Team Usage</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INVESTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Pitch</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUTH BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-0.5M</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUTH PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/analysis</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11-15 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation/Logistics</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior club funding</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private funding</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA solidarity payments</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions league/NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions municipal/state</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions membership/parents</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION**

- No facility is used only by one of the clubs' men's first team.
- Clubs reported an average of 3 FTE for youth development scouting/analysis purposes; only six countries reported a higher number.
- Third highest average distance between training facility and stadium used for home matches (trailing only Armenia and Russia).

**KEY INFO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>19,522,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Division Revenue</td>
<td>€59m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Division Clubs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPATING CLUBS**

- Sepsi Sfantu Gheorghești
- CFR 1907 Cluj
- CS Constanța Chiajna
- CS Ceahlăul Piatra Neamț
- FC Astra Giurgiu
- FC Botoșani
- FC Dynamo București
- FC Hermannstadt
- FC Sibiu
- FC Universitatea Craiova
- FC Viitorul Constanța
- FC Voluntari
- FCM Dunărea Galați
- FC Steaua
- FC Universitatea Craiova
- FC Universitatea Cluj

**INSIGHTS**

- Of clubs that have refurbished their facilities, 36% spent an average of €1.3M per refurbishment.
- 93% of the population is primary school, 7% secondary school.
- 100% of clubs have at least one facility.
- 14 clubs participate, with one to two facilities each.

---

**Legend**

- **CLUBS**: 14
- **FACILITIES**: 15
- **AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES**: 11.9

---

**Notes**

- Contributions league/NA: 50%
- Contributions municipal/state: 13%
- Contributions membership/parents: 33%

---

**Back to Menu**
RUSSIA

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>18.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLUBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.9</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>38%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Grass Pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Team Usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Team Usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>€1.8M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Spent per Refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

INVESTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>€2.0-3.0M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGIN OF FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>42%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior club funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA solidarity payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions league/FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions municipal/State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 FTE</th>
<th>4 FTE</th>
<th>3 FTE</th>
<th>4 FTE</th>
<th>3 FTE</th>
<th>5 FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation/logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INFO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>143,896,000</th>
<th>€752m</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP DIVISION CLubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTICIPATING CLUBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FC Arsenal Tula</th>
<th>FC Dynamo Moskva</th>
<th>FC Spartak Moskva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FC Dresden</td>
<td>FC Krasnodar</td>
<td>FC Tampov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FC Ederburg</td>
<td>FC Lokomotiv Moskva</td>
<td>FC Ufa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PFC CSKA Moskva</td>
<td>FC Rostov</td>
<td>FC Ural Ekaterinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PFC Krylya Svetov</td>
<td>FC Rubin</td>
<td>FC Zenit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSIGHTS

10 clubs have youth boarding facilities for more than 25 players in place, trailing only Turkey and France in this category.

Clubs dedicate typically 16-20 FTE to coaching of youth teams. This range is the shared highest value across Europe.

FK Tambov is the club with the largest distance between training facility and the stadium they currently use for home matches (300km).
### San Marino

#### General
- **Clubs**: 15
- **Facilities**: 8
- **Average Age of Facilities**: 20.0

#### Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Tracking</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Tracking</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with EDU. Inst.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Boarding</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Facilities</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely used by Men’s 1st Team</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Team Usage</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Team Usage</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Investment

- **53% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities**
- **€0.4M average spent per refurbishment**

#### Youth Budget

- **€0.0-0.5M**: 63%
- **€0.5-2M**: 37%

#### Youth Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/analysis</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Origin of Funding

- **Senior club funding**: NA
- **Private funding**: NA
- **UEFA solidarity payments**: NA
- **Contribution league/NA**: NA
- **Contribution municipal/state**: NA
- **Contribution membership/parents**: NA

* Clubs did not provide information related to the breakdown of youth development budget financing.

#### Insights
- All training facilities are owned by the San Marino Olympic Committee.
- National football association promoted the use of technical tracking tools to the top division explaining their high usage in this category.
- Facilities from San Marino are the second-most condensed in Europe (only 5km on average between each other).
SCOTLAND

GENERAL

- **CLUBS**: 12
- **OWNERSHIP**
  - 50% Football Club
  - 6% Private Owner
  - 31% Municipal
  - 0% Government
  - 13% Other

FACILITIES

- **NATURAL GRASS PITCHES**: 3.8
- **ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCHES**: 2.1
- **INDOOR TRAINING**: 75%
- **FITNESS EQUIPMENT**: 92%

- **MEDICAL TRACKING**: 92%
- **TECHNICAL TRACKING**: 92%
- **COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.**: 83%
- **YOUTH BOARDING**: 8%

USAGE

- **SHARING FACILITIES**: 83%
- **SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM**: 6%

- **WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE**: 67%
- **YOUTH TEAM USAGE**: 83%

INVESTMENT

- **100% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES**
- **€1.9M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT**

- **NEW PITCHES**: 2
  - €0-0.5M
  - €0.5-1.0M
  - €1.9M
- **NEW FACILITY**: 1
- **GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS**: 67%
- **FULL REFURBISHMENT**: 13%
- **ORGANISATION/LOGISTICS**: 13%
- **MEDICAL**: 6%
- **EDUCATION**: 7%
- **COACHING**: 13%
- **Scouting/Analysis**: 6%
- **Full-time Equivalent (FTE)**
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2
  - Medical: 1.2
  - Education: 1.2
  - Coaching: 5.7
  - Scouting/Analysis: 1.2

YOUTH BUDGET

- **€0.5-1.0M TYPICAL BUDGET**

- **ORIGIN OF FUNDING**
  - 62% Senior club funding
  - 4% Private funding
  - 13% UEFA solidarity payments
  - 23% Contributions leagues/nation
  - 0% Contributions municipal/state
  - 0% Contributions membership/parents

INSIGHTS

- Three quarters of surveyed facilities in Scotland are shared with other football or other sports’ clubs.
- Three quarters of clubs have indoor training facilities available to them at their training facility.
- Second highest percentage of training facilities owned by the football club.
**Selling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ownership**

- 22% Football Club
- 6% Private Owner
- 61% Municipal
- 11% Government
- 0% Other

**Facilities**

- Medical Tracking
- Technical Tracking
- Youth Boarding
- Indoor Training
- Fitness Equipment

**Usage**

- 43% Sharing Facilities
- 21% Solely Used by Men's 1st Team
- 29% Women's Team Usage
- 93% Youth Team Usage

**Investment**

- 93% of Clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.5M average spent per refurbishment

**Youth Budget**

- €0.0-0.5M

**Youth Personnel**

- Averages Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Dedicated To:
  - Organisation/Logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 3 FTE
  - Education: 1.2 FTE
  - Coaching: 5.7 FTE
  - Scouting/Analysis: 1.2 FTE

**Insights**

- Second most historic reported age of facilities (average duration since inauguration): 42 years
- Only 7% of facilities have an indoor pitch available, one of the lowest shares in Europe
- Five top division teams are located in Belgrade, the shared second highest single city concentration in Europe

**Key Info**

- Population: 6,965,000
- Top Division Revenue: €52m
- Top Division Clubs: 16

**Participating Clubs**

- FK Napredak
- FK Partizan
- FK Radnicki Niš
- FK Spartak Subotica
- FK Voždovac
- FK Backa Palanka
- FK Crvena Zvezda
- FK Čukarički
- FK Mladost Lučani
- FK Proleter 2006
- FK Rad
- FK Radnik Surdulica
- FK Vojvodina
- Macva Sabac

**Origin of Funding**

- 53% Senior club funding
- 5% Private funding
- 3% UEFA solidarity payments
- 15% Contributions municipal/state
- 12% Contributions membership/parents

FK Dinamo Vranje and FK Zemun did not provide information for this questionnaire.
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Tracking</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Tracking</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Edu. Inst.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Boarding</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Facilities</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely used by Men’s 1st Team</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Team Usage</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Team Usage</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment

- 90% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €0.4M average spent per refurbishment
- 6 facilities
- 2 facilities
- 2 new pitches
- 1-2 FTE senior infrastructure improvements
- 23% new pitches
- 28% general infrastructure improvements
- 15% full refurbishment
- 8% partial refurbishment

### Youth Budget

- €0.5M typical budget
- 90% contributions from parental fees
- 7% private funding
- 7% senior club funding
- 87% government
- 10% UEFA solidarity payments

### Youth Personnel

- Average full-time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to:
  - Organisation/logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 1.2 FTE
  - Education: 1.2 FTE
  - Coaching: 4 FTE
  - Scouting/analysis: 0.1 FTE

### Key Info

- Population: 2,069,000
- Top Division Revenue: €18m
- Top Division Clubs: 10
- Participating Clubs:
  - NK Celje
  - NK Domžale
  - NK Tabor Sežana
  - NK Triglav
  - ASK Bravo Publikum
  - ND Mura 05
  - NK Aluminij
  - NK Olimpija Ljubljana
  - NK Rudar Velenje

### Insights

- All top division clubs have collaborations with educational institutes in place.
- No single youth development funding category makes up for more than 30%, illustrating a balanced picture.
- Almost 9 out of 10 facilities are owned by municipalities in Slovenia.
On average, top division clubs employ 5-7 FTE for non-coaching youth development matters trailing only Italy.

One of only two countries where all participating clubs reported to have fitness centre equipment and technical tracking in use at their training facilities.

Only one of two top divisions with multiple top division teams in four different cities.
SWEDEN

**GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWNERSHIP**

- 11% Football Club
- 11% Private owner
- 61% Municipal
- 11% Government
- 7% Other

**FACILITIES**

- 1.4 Natural grass pitches
- 2.4 Artificial grass pitches
- 56% Indoor training
- 75% Fitness equipment

**USAGE**

- 88% Sharing facilities
- 4% Solely used by men’s 1st team
- 50% Women’s team usage
- 88% Youth team usage

**INVESTMENT**

- 75% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- €1.2M average spent per refurbishment

**INVESTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>€0.0-0.5M</th>
<th>€0.5-2.0M</th>
<th>€2.5-5.0M</th>
<th>&gt;€5.0M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New pitches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full refurbishment</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUTH BUDGET**

- €0.5-1M typical budget

**ORIGIN OF FUNDING**

- 28%: Senior club funding
- 6%: Private funding
- 15%: UEFA solidarity payments
- 12%: Contributions league/SA
- 19%: Contributions municipal/state
- 12%: Contributions membership/parents

**YOUTH PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation/logistics</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting/analysis</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSIGHTS**

- No single youth development funding category makes up for more than 30%, illustrating a balanced picture
- Nine clubs have an indoor training facility available to them, only five countries reported a higher number
- In line with the other Scandinavian countries, top division clubs are more heavily concentrated in Southern half of the country
## Switzerland

### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

- **7%** Football Club
- **29%** Private Club
- **57%** Municipal
- **7%** Government
- **0%** Other

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Grass Pitches</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Usage

- **60%** Sharing Facilities
- **7%** Solely Used by Men's 1st Team
- **60%** Women's Team Usage
- **90%** Youth Team Usage

### Investment

- **40%** of Clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- **€5.5M** Average spent per refurbishment

### Youth Budget

- **€2.0-3.0M** Typical Budget

### Youth Personnel

- **Average Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Dedicated To:**
  - Organisation/Logistics: 1.2 FTE
  - Medical: 0.1 FTE
  - Education: 0.3 FTE
  - Coaching: 8.10 FTE
  - Scouting/Analysis: 1.2 FTE

### Insights

- On average, clubs have invested €5.5 million per refurbishment. Only Hungary had a higher average.
- One of five countries where club youth budgets range from less than €500k to more than €5 million.
- All top division clubs have collaborations with educational institutions in place.
### TURKEY

#### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average Age of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ownership

- **19%** Football Club
- **6%** Private Owner
- **48%** Municipal
- **26%** Government
- **0%** Other

#### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Grass Pitches</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitches</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Training</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Facilities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Team Usage</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Team Usage</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INVESTMENT

- 72% of clubs have refurbished their facilities
- Average spent per refurbishment: **€0.8M**

#### Youth Budget

- **€0.5-1.0M**

#### Key Info

- **Population**: 83,023,000
- **Top Division Revenue**: €748m
- **Top Division Clubs**: 18

#### Participating Clubs

- Akhisar Belediyespor
- Alanyaspor
- Antalyaspor
- BB Erzurumspor
- Beşiktaş JK
- Bursaspor
- Galatasaray
- Göztepe
- Fenerbahçe SK
- Iftar Belediyespor
- İstanbul Başakşehir
- Kayserispor
- Kasımpaşa SK
- Kayserispor
- Konyaspor
- MKE Ankaragücü
- Malatyaspor
- Kayserispor
- Sivasspor
- Trabzonspor AŞ
- Trabzonspor

#### Insights

- 17 out of 18 clubs have a youth boarding facility in place, equivalent to 94%. This is the highest ratio Europe-wide.
- One of the only two countries in Europe where clubs declare they don’t share their facilities in any way.
- Five top division teams are located in Istanbul, the shared second highest single city concentration Europe.

---

**Contributions membership/ parents**

**Private funding**

**Contributions league/ NA**

**Contributions municipal/ state**

**Senior club funding**

**UEFA solidarity payments**

- **60%**, **2%**, **10%**, **9%**, **18%**, **0%**, **29%**, **0%**, **67%**

**Contributions membership/ parents**

- **3 FTE**, **4 FTE**, **1-2 FTE**, **11-15 FTE**, **3 FTE**

---

**Back to Menu**
UKRAINE

GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE OF FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWNERSHIP

| 39% FOOTBALL CLUB | 33% PRIVATE OWNER | 11% MUNICIPAL | 6% GOVERNMENT | 11% OTHER |

FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDICAL TRACKING</th>
<th>TECHNICAL TRACKING</th>
<th>COLLABORATION WITH EDU. INST.</th>
<th>INDOOR TRAINING</th>
<th>FITNESS EQUIPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHARING FACILITIES</th>
<th>SOLELY USED BY MEN’S 1ST TEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN’S TEAM USAGE</th>
<th>YOUTH TEAM USAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTMENT

83% OF CLUBS THAT HAVE REFURBISHED THEIR FACILITIES

€0.4M AVERAGE SPENT PER REFURBISHMENT

YOUTH BUDGET

€0.0-0.5M TYPICAL BUDGET

INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS MEMBERSHIP/ PARENTS</th>
<th>PRIVATE FUNDING</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS LEAGUE/ NA</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS MUNICIPAL/ STATE</th>
<th>SENIOR CLUB FUNDING</th>
<th>UEFA SOLIDARITY PAYMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH PERSONNEL

AVERAGE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) DEDICATED TO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION/ LOGISTICS</th>
<th>MEDICAL</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>COACHING</th>
<th>SCOUTING/ ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 FTE</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
<td>11-15 FTE</td>
<td>1-2 FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTICIPATING CLUBS

- FC Chornomorets Odesa
- FC Dynamo Kyiv
- FC Illyichiv Mariupol
- FC Karpaty Lviv
- FC Oleksandria
- FC Oskolka Poltava
- FC Arseny Kyiv
- FC Dona Chernihiv
- FC Lviv
- FC Olimpik Donetsk
- FC Shakhtar Donetsk
- FC Zorya Luhansk

INSIGHTS

- 83% of clubs have refurbished their facility (last ten years), way above the European average.
- More than two-third of youth development budget is financed by UEFA Solidarity Payments, the second highest value across the board.
- FC Zorya Luhansk, FC Olimpik Donetsk, and FC Shakhtar Donetsk currently train and play their home matches in different city’s as they originate from.

KEY INFO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>TOP DIVISION REVENUE</th>
<th>TOP DIVISION CLUBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44,623,000</td>
<td>€111m</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACK TO MENU
Wales

**General**
- 12 clubs
- 17 facilities
- Average age of facilities: 32.0

**Ownership**
- 47% Football Club
- 12% Private Owner
- 24% Municipal
- 0% Government
- 18% Other

**Facilities**
- Medical Tracking: 1.6
- Technical Tracking: 1.3
- Indoor Training: 25%
- Fitness Equipment: 42%

**Usage**
- Sharing Facilities: 100%
- Solely Used by Men’s 1st Team: 0%
- Women’s Team Usage: 67%
- Youth Team Usage: 83%

**Investment**
- 75% of clubs that have refurbished their facilities
- Average spent per refurbishment: €0.6M

**Youth Budget**
- Typical Budget: €0-0.5M

**Insights**
- Three quarters of clubs reported to be the owner of their primary training facility, the third highest ratio across the board.
- Country that benefits the most from UEFA solidarity payments.
- In total, these contributions made up for 70% of the youth development budgets in Wales.
- One of four countries with a broad national representation of no two clubs based in the same town or city.