

THE COLOGNE REPORT

presented by

One World Event Working Group

Martin Iversen Christensen

Shamey Cramer

Joanie Evans

Greg Larocque

Armin Lohrmann

Barry Taylor

January 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I - HISTORIC CHRONOLOGY

II - INTRODUCTION

III - One WE SURVEY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IV - One WE SURVEY RESPONSES

V - CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF 1WE ORGANIZATION

VI - GOVERNANCE OF One WE ENTITY

VII - One WE ENTITY

VIII - PROCESS TO ACHIEVE

IX - TRANSITION COMMISSION

X - SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE

XI - TIMELINE

XII - SUMMARY

- APPENDICES

A.) Definition of Terms

B.) Actual Survey Results

C.) Sample of Comments

D.) Working Group Biographies

E.) Sample Founding Charter

I - HISTORIC CHRONOLOGY

To understand the genesis of this report, one must understand the Gay Games Movement history from which it was borne. A history that begins with the genius of U.S. Olympian Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. and his creation of the Gay Olympic Games.

1980. Dr. Waddell announces his plan for San Francisco to host a “Gay Olympic Games.”

4 November 1981. Dr. Waddell and others incorporate San Francisco Arts & Athletics, the first governing body to oversee the production of the inaugural Gay Olympic Games. Due to a lawsuit by the United States Olympic Committee, the event officially becomes Gay Games I. This is the first time the Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender-Queer-Intersex community and allies come together to produce an international event that uses sport and culture to address human rights issues such as homophobia, sexism, racism, ageism and other forms of discrimination.

January 1982. Dr. Waddell launches the International Gay Olympic Association. It is his vision to have an international governing body steward the Gay Games on a quadrennial basis. The first task is the creation of the Rules & Regulations that govern each sport presented at Gay Games I. This document is compiled by IGOA and Team Minnesota co-founder Jean Nickolaus Tretter, and later becomes known as the Gay Games Red Book.

28 August - 05 September 1982. 1350 athletes and 300 artists participate in the inaugural Gay Games I in San Francisco.

Immediately following Gay Games I, various disciplines establish local teams and international governing bodies for those participating in the Gay Games Movement. These governing bodies begin to host festivals and tournaments on an annual basis and provide a network of events and organizations.

October 1982 - July 1985. The IGOA conducts monthly conference calls and produces a quarterly newsletter. IGOA members include Dr. Waddell and Sara Waddell Lewinstein, plus representatives from Boston, Los Angeles, Minnesota, Oakland, Toronto and Vancouver.

April 1983. Dr. Waddell and SFAA host the first Gay Games II community

meeting in San Francisco. The IGOA is in attendance and transcribes the minutes. Team Minnesota presents the 1986 Winter Gay Olympic Games proposal that is endorsed by SFAA, but never produced.

June 1983 - June 1985. Team Los Angeles founder Shamey Cramer and Co-Chairs Rand Wiseman-Curtright and Phil Manciero, IGOA members, produce the Festival Games in conjunction with Gay Pride and Frontrunners' Run For Pride 5k/10k race. It becomes the first annual multi-sport tournament hosted by the LGBTQI community.

January 1984. Team Minnesota hosts the first IGOA Co-Chair's conference in St. Paul. The IGOA disbands in the Fall of 1985 due to the impact of the AIDS epidemic and other constraints hindering its cohesiveness in the pre-Internet era.

August 1986. SFAA produces Gay Games II in San Francisco.

11 July 1987. Dr. Waddell passes away due to complications from AIDS.

July 1989. Representatives from the various governing bodies transform San Francisco Arts & Athletics into the Federation of Gay Games, an international governing body that takes stewardship of the Gay Games following Gay Games III: Vancouver 1990.

1989. The European Gay & Lesbian Sport Federation is founded.

August 1990. Vancouver autonomously produces Gay Games III.

1992. EGLSF produces EuroGames, the first continent-specific LGBTQI multi-sport festival. It is produced annually except in Gay Games years.

When the FGG takes charge of the Gay Games, they conduct a bid process to determine the host city, which includes Gay Games IV: New York 1994, Gay Games V: Amsterdam 1998 and Gay Games VI: Sydney 2002.

October 2001. Montreal becomes the presumptive host for Gay Games VII.

November 2003. At the FGG Annual Meeting in Chicago, Montreal organizers and the FGG are unable to come to terms, and both parties end negotiations.

December 2003. The FGG invites the other bidding finalists to resubmit, with

Chicago being selected to host Gay Games VII in August 2006.

January 2004. Montreal organizers create the Gay & Lesbian International Sports Association (GLISA International). They also establish continental organizations for Africa, Asia/Pacific, Latin America and North America that produce regional multi-sport events similar in scope to the EGLSF's EuroGames.

2005-2006. The FGG undergoes a major organizational restructuring to create an Executive Board and an Assembly with representation from the various governing bodies.

2006. First World Outgames in Montreal Quebec Canada attracts more than 12 000 participants.

2007. GLISA Continental Association founded - GLISA North America and GLISA Asia Pacific.

July 2009. Second World OutGames in Copenhagen with the FGG hosting one in their series of "The Future of LGBT Sport and Culture" conferences.

2009-2010. Ongoing meetings and discussions between FGG and GLISA leadership.

March 2010. At the EGLSF AGA in Manchester, FGG Co-Presidents Emy Ritt and Kurt Dahl, and GLISA Co-Presidents Wessel van Kampen and Julia Applegate sign a seven-point agreement that includes the creation of a joint Steering Committee.

August 2010. Gay Games VIII in Cologne. FGG Assembly approves the plan for a One Quadrennial Event (1QE) Working Group.

November 2011. 1QE Working Group created. FGG members include Co-Presidents Kurt Dahl and Emy Ritt plus Jon Baldan, Leigh-Ann Naidoo, Paul Oostenbrug, Martyn Pickup and Kelly Stevens. GLISA members include Co-Presidents Julia Applegate and Wessel van Kampen plus Sumit Badhra, Gloria Careaga, Thomas Dolan, Kevin Hanui, and Lin McDevitt-Pugh. When Dolan resigns, he is replaced by Nelson Lee.

July 2011. 1QE Working Group meetings in Amsterdam.

October 2011. GLISA Co-President Wessel van Kampen attends FGG AGA in Toronto for talks.

May 2012. Each Board selects representatives for a 1QE Negotiating Team to participate in a weekend summit hosted by Equipe Montreal to finalize the agreements drawn up by the 1QE Working Group. Representing GLISA are Co-Presidents Julia Applegate and Wessel van Kampen plus Nelson Lee and Daniel Vaudrin with Catherine Meade as legal advisor. Representing the FGG are Co-President Kurt Dahl plus Shamey Cramer, Klaus Heusslein and Dennis Sneyers with Jason Stone as legal advisor. A Global Sports Plan is prepared that allows for the two organizations to co-exist and jointly select and manage a host for 1QE in 2018, thus doubling the License Fee to be paid by the Host Organization. At the end of the three days, the Agreement is rejected.

September 2013. Following World OutGames III in Antwerp, the FGG sends a letter to GLISA inviting them to resume discussions and co-host a series of public meetings. A series of letters are exchanged between leadership.

January 2014. The FGG hosts a Town Hall discussion at Sin City Shootout in Las Vegas with GLISA and OutGames IV: Miami 2017 representatives in attendance. Moderator Race Cowgill and attendees draft the first version of what will become the One World Event Global Survey.

March 2014. FGG and GLISA agree to a meeting hosted by EGLSF at their Annual General Assembly in Ljubljana. FGG representatives include Armin Lohrmann and former Co-President Emy Ritt; GLISA representatives include Paul Brummitt and OutGames IV executive Ivan Cano; and EGLSF representatives include Co-Presidents Armelle Maze and Klaus Heusslein plus Annette Wachter.

A seven-point Memorandum is drawn up and signed by FGG and GLISA leadership that creates the six-member One World Event (1WE) Working Group with GLISA Representatives Martin Iversen Christensen, Greg Larocque and Barry Taylor; and FGG representatives Shamey Cramer, Joanie Evans and Armin Lohrmann.

August-October 2014. The Memorandum is further defined and expanded to nine points by the 1WE Working Group to include a four-day in-person work session. 1WE Working Group members meet during Gay Games 9 in Cleveland. The 1WE Survey is released, eliciting more than 1700 responses.

11-14 December 2014. The 1WE Working Group meeting hosted by SC Janus in Cologne. They release the Cologne Brief to both Boards summarizing the results of their work session including the outline for the forthcoming Cologne Report.

January 2015. The 1WE Working Group presents its recommendations in the Cologne Report.

II.) INTRODUCTION

When reviewing the history of the Gay Games Movement, the 1WE Working Group came to the realization that since the founding of San Francisco Arts & Athletics, there have been seven iterations of organizations governing the twelve quadrennial events that have been presented to date, with the most recent iteration occurring with the FGG Board restructuring ten years ago.

Many advances have been made in the past decade regarding LGBTQI rights, as well as with global communications and technology. It is clear that for those who govern and manage global LGBTQI sports and culture entities, we are at another turning point. As daunting as this task may be, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not accept the responsibility to ensure the mission begun more than thirty years ago continues in a healthy and robust manner, moving forward for the next generation of athletes, artists and advocates.

During the past decade, much work has been done by GLISA International and the FGG that makes this report possible. Of particular note is the One Quadrennial Event Working Group that preceded the 1WE Working Group. But there has also been much public criticism by the combined constituency our two organizations serve.

As a result, we knew early on it would be necessary to engage as many of our constituents as possible. Thanks to the internet, we now have the ability to obtain massive amounts of raw data within days, even though the process to collect and analyze that data takes months.

Building on the recommendations of the membership of the FGG and GLISA International, the 1WE Survey, and our discussions in Cologne, the 1WE Working Group has created a framework for a quadrennial One World Event consisting of Sport, Culture and Human Rights to be produced in 2022; and what will be required to achieve this goal.

In order to best achieve the goal of producing 1WE, it is also the recommendation of this Working Group that a new governing body be created to steward this quadrennial event. This can either be done as a merger of one group into the other, which will require a large and possibly complicated restructuring of the governing documents; or by the creation of a new entity incorporating the best of each organization.

To achieve the broadest involvement in developing this new governing body, we further recommend that the FGG and GLISA International co-host a World Congress to convene in the third quarter of 2015 with representation from all parties that have a vested interest in promoting a quadrennial One Word Event consisting of Sport, Culture and Human Rights.

The FGG and GLISA International Boards need to commit to co-finance and attend the event, and invite their member organizations as well as other individuals and governing bodies from outside their constituencies to participate - both in person and via electronic means.

Doing so allows the global LGBTQI sports movement to achieve a greater level of participation and inclusion from those it seeks to serve, and provides a greater sense of (assuredness) in regards to the direction and advancement of our mission in the immediate future.

The 1WE Working Group realizes that should this plan be enacted, these recommendations require further actions by each organization in regards to its governance and fiscal matters, as well as the continuation of its mission within the context of a new non-government organization. Many of these issues need to be discussed by the Transition Commission with their own set of recommendations as to how to proceed with the next steps of transformation.

The 1WE Working Group would like to thank the Boards of FGG and GLISA for entrusting us with the opportunity to present this proposal to create a One World Event for the global LGBTQI community and look forward to continue serving the community.

III - ONE WE SURVEY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Change is not an easy thing to accomplish. Nevertheless, when it is inevitable, one must make bold decisions to advance our mission without any less regard for the core principles that have guided this work since the day Dr. Tom Waddell first put his idea into action.

Many advances have been made in the past decade regarding LGBTQI rights, as well as with global communications and technology. It is clear that for those who govern and manage global LGBTQI sports, Human Rights, and culture entities, we are at another turning point. As daunting as this task may be, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not accept the responsibility to ensure the mission begun more than thirty years ago continues in a healthy and robust manner, moving forward for the next generation of athletes, artists and advocates.

Clear direction from the community

A One World Event Survey was conducted among the memberships of the Federation and GLISA in order to ascertain their views, preferences, concerns, and wishes with respect to the possibility of having a single global event in the future.

Both the Gay Games and the Outgames have a significant sports component, but only the Outgames has separate Human Rights and Culture components. This has been a contentious point in the past and it was felt wisest to address it head-on. Thirdly, an overall demographic of respondents was sought to identify those most likely to be affected by the outcomes of the Survey.

With respect to providing guidance to future event planners, Question 6 (Q6) highlighted what respondents felt should be the overall objective of One World Event. These included, in order of importance, "*improving the visibility of LGBTI athletes, artists and advocates*" (85%), "*reducing homophobia in mainstream sport*" (79%), "*encouraging people to participate more in LGBTI sports, culture, Human Rights events*" (79%), "*improve the acceptance of LGBTI individuals*" (77%), "*improve the Human Rights of LGBTI individuals*" (65%), and "*promote the work of LGBTI sports, culture, Human Rights organizations*" (64%).

With respect to providing a three-component One World Event or a single sports-based One World Event, respondents clearly preferred the former (Q4, Q6, Q22). While the greatest numbers of participants would be in sports competitions (Q22),

this did not subordinate the Human Rights and Culture components. In point of fact, the "*very important/important level of importance*" assigned by respondents to the sports, Human Rights, and culture components was 91%, 77%, and 75% respectively. Therefore, though the sports events will engage the greatest number of individuals, the Human Rights and culture components had substance, integrity and a distinctness of their own.

"One Event - One Organization"

Building on the recommendations of the membership of the FGG and GLISA International, the One_WE Survey, and our discussions in Cologne, the One WE Working Group has created a framework for a quadrennial One World Event consisting of Sport, Culture and Human Rights to be produced in 2022, and what will be required to achieve this goal.

The Working Group is recommending the creation of a new One World Event Entity. A new entity, whose first external task would be to plan and deliver One World Event in 2022, would be more than a merger of the existing organizations. In point of fact, a new One World Event entity would be the "home base", the "platform" for other organizations serving specific needs of the same global LGBTQI communities.

A One World Event entity would encompass issues related to sport, culture, and human rights for the global LGBTQI through the delivery of its signature quadrennial activity - "One World Event".

The need for **an inclusive and representative governing body** within the One World Event entity would not be significantly different in from the current workings of either organization presently. However, representation of the various global communities/organizations, and presentation and pursuit of their issues, would need to be accommodated in whatever governing structure would be proposed.

The **history** of each organization would be protected and reflected in the workings of the One World Event entity, as this would form the basis for any new governing construct. Yet, the present limitations of each organization's histories would not solely dictate future directions. In other words, one can move forward with the best aspects and abandon less satisfactory circumstances.

The process of **site selection and delivery** of One World Event would be a

collaborative effort of the new participants. Since both organizations have similar selection processes and selection parameters, integration and enhancement of a single process would occur.

With respect to **revenue**, the One World Event entity would be the single recipient of One World Event resources, such as licensing fees, event income, and sponsorship. With respect to approaching sponsors, the new One World Event entity would offer an integrated vision encompassing three components, thus providing wider coverage for sponsors.

The One World Event entity would use the **combined staff** of the two founding organizations, thus expanding the reach of the various programs, services, and information currently offered by two different organizations.

IV - ONE WORLD EVENT SURVEY RESPONSES

The purpose of the One World Event Survey was to canvas the memberships of the Federation and GLISA to ascertain their views, preferences, concerns, and wishes with respect to the possibility of having a single global event in the future.

The survey began modestly but grew to include questions which the Working Group deemed useful to those who might well be planning a single large global event in approximately 2022. As well, a second goal was to seek out respondents' preference, or not, for a multi-component event. Both the Gay Games and the Outgames have a significant sports component, but only the Outgames has separate Human Rights and Culture components. This has been a contentious point in the past and it was felt wisest to address it head-on. And, thirdly, an overall demographic of respondents was sought to identify those most likely to be affected by the outcomes of the Survey.

In completing the Survey, the first opportunity to provide responses was accorded to member organization in the Federation and GLISA. These members were asked to have a single individual complete the Survey and, where possible, to engage others in their responses. In short, a single individual was asked to speak for their whole member organization. In this regard, the demographics would be skewed if a male club member was the designated respondent rather than a female member. A second phase of the Survey allowed "interested stakeholders", such as member organizations of the EGLSF, to complete the questionnaire.

With respect to the last goal, the demographic of the most number respondents was a male, age 45-59, who had attended similar events at the global, regional, and local levels. In addition, a significant number of women responded, fully 1/4 of the respondents. They, too, had attended global, regional, and local events. Of note was the minimal response from either end of the age spectrum, youth at one end and elders at the other. The proportions were approximately the same for those under 35 and those over 60, with fewer than 15% of responses for each. These responses allowed extrapolation into other responses, such as barriers to participation, as discussed below. Similarly, the percentage of transgender respondents was disappointing in the extreme, less than 2%.

With respect to providing guidance to future event planners, Question 6 (Q6) highlighted what respondents felt should be the overall objective of One World Event. These included, in order of importance, "*improving the visibility of LGBTI*

athletes, artists and advocates" (85%), "reducing homophobia in mainstream sport" (79%), "encouraging people to participate more in LGBTI sports, culture, Human Rights events" (79%), "improve the acceptance of LGBTI individuals" (77%), "improve the Human Rights of LGBTI individuals" (65%), and "promote the work of LGBTI sports, culture, Human Rights organizations" (64%). Such responses underscored respondents' awareness of the global impact of One World Event and the potential for such an event to create a very different quality of life for LGBTI individuals than is now experienced by so many individuals in different parts of the world. Clearly, respondents want to see a better life for members of the community worldwide come from One World Event.

In the actual delivery of One World Event (Q8, Q9), respondents wanted to see a good competitive field for their sports competitions, clearly a quality and scope well above a regional or local level. Related to this was the ability of participants to participate in multiple events and not be excluded from related events due to scheduling conflicts, for example, if all running (track, road, distance) events were scheduled for a single weekend period. Relating to the above responses, individuals also wanted to see that there was sufficient positive local media focus on One World Event that the host area would become more LGBTI-friendly.

The most significant deterrents were high cost and the need to travel. In the latter regard, this would likely refer to not only the cost factor, but also to the limited availability of individuals to leave their employment to attend One World Event. Combined with the respondents' being able to participate in multiple events, it seems clear that individuals want to get "the biggest bang for their buck" if they're going to spend personal funds and take vacation time to attend One World Event. In order to plan their travel and participation in a quadrennial global event (Q3, Q11, Q12), participants needed to be comfortable that the experience would be worth their efforts.

With respect to providing a three-component One World Event or a single sports-based One World Event, respondents clearly preferred the former (Q4, Q6, Q22). While the greatest numbers of participants would be in sports competitions (Q22), this did not subordinate the Human Rights and Culture components. In point of fact, the "*very important/important level of importance*" assigned by respondents to the sports, Human Rights, and culture components was 91%, 77%, and 75% respectively. So, though the sports events will engage the greatest number of individuals, the Human Rights and culture components had substance, integrity and a distinctness of their own.

Lastly, the responses to several questions (Q2, Q3, Q12) suggested that, in the intervening years between One World Event, respondents would find it useful to have smaller, regional events of the same scope as One World Event. This would make some mitigation available for LGBTI community members who found they were unable to attend a single global event. In this way, the various continental areas could still celebrate the LGBTI "*athlete, artist, and activist.*"

V - CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ONE WE ORGANIZATION

In both the Ljubljana entente and the early statement of goals of the One World Event Working Group, it was noted that the eventuality might arise where serious consideration would occur of whether it was necessary for two separate entities to individually represent and support the global LGBTQI community.

In the Cologne meetings, this issue was discussed with the following considerations of each reasonable and viable option to deliver One World Event for the foreseeable future from 2022. Several models were identified and each was examined for its strengths and weaknesses and whether it reflected the input of the membership who responded to the recent questionnaire. These discussions and conclusion are described below.

Option 1 - Two Hosting Organizations for One World Event

This Option looked at the feasibility of both existing organizations, the Federation of Gay Games and GLISA International, co-hosting One World Event.

On the positive side, there would be little need for significant change in the **governance structure** of either organization. The By-laws of the Federation would need minor amending to allow wording accommodating a joint event and a name change for the quarterly event. But these revisions would be minor.

The Bylaws of GLISA International would need limited changes, noting a different name for the quadrennial signature event. An impact would be felt in GLISA's Continental Associations which might consider altering the name of their quadrennial event to reflect some iteration of One World Event.

Both Boards would remain essentially intact within the scope of their existing governance documents. Their **internal and external activities** would be able to continue as they are now.

However, **budgets and resources** would be impacted as the costs for and revenues from One World Event would be shared accordingly. This would inevitably mean fewer resources for each organization to carry out their separate chosen mandates. As well, this might require complicated and expensive protocols to be negotiated between both organizations to secure their proper portion of any monies generated from One World Event.

Additionally, the **selection of future host cities** would be impacted as this Option would need to be a shared responsibility between the organizations: representatives from each organization would need to be appointed, joint event parameters would have to be established, and specific duties would need to be assigned in a balanced way.

That said, interacting with **two separate hosts** would create logistical and programming issues that would make the delivery of One World Event challenging in the extreme. It might well be that the pool of candidates would correspondingly smaller when confronted by this reality.

The Working Group **does not recommend** this option.

Option 2 - Co-Hosting by the Federation and GLISA

This Option is a hybrid of the Option above. That said, **some limited changes** would still be required in governance documents, **internal and external activities** for each organization would proceed within the scope of each organization, and the "**corporate structure and culture**" would remain largely unchanged.

What would be different, however, would be the **vehicle for the selection of a host city** and the responsibility for working with the selected host city **to deliver One World Event**. To do so, a separate and stand-alone organization would be created. Members of this organization would be separate from both organizations. They would initially be identified by each organization, and even possibly from outside both organizations, and would be responsible for the delivery of One World Event. These individuals would not be beholden to either organization. In sum, their fundamental task would be the delivery of One World Event.

Serious drawbacks exist with this Option. First, the event-delivery organization would have **two organizations (FGG and GLISA) to be accountable to**, and it is within the realm of possibility, if not likely, that there would be conflicting directions or goals from each organization that would be given to the event-delivery organization to implement. This might well cause confusion and delays in host city selection and the delivery of One World Event, not to say the confusion that would exist with the selected host city as they prepare for One World Event.

As with the previous Option, any license fee, revenue and other accrued benefits

would necessarily need to support both organization. To do so, such a fee, or sponsorship revenue, of participation **fees would be exorbitant** and would be contrary to member feedback that cost itself is one of the dis-incentives to participation in any global event.

The Working Group **does not recommend** this option.

Option 3 - Merger of the Federation and GLISA

In this Option, one organization be absorbed by the other. Either the Federation or GLISA would cease to exist as an entity. The scope, breadth, history, and programs would be subsumed by the other organization and incorporated within their existing structure.

Such an action would require **moderate to heavy revisions** to the remaining organization's By-Laws and might well require **re-registering** with the appropriate government jurisdictions.

Such an action would require a costly **third-party financial assessment** of both organizations. This assessment, as is usual in such transactions, would be dedicated to sustain the programs and services of the disappearing entity.

The financial arrangements and protections for the programs and services of the disappearing entity would require **heavy legal fees** to protect the intellectual assets of the disappearing organization. Additionally, **standing organization-to-organization protocols** would have to be discussed, understood, and maintained by the continuing organization.

In sum, one organization's **internal functions** would cease to exist and would be implemented within the other organization. The continuing organization's **external functions** would be significantly impacted as the organization continued the delivery of programs, services, and standing protocols of the disappearing organization.

The Working Group **does not recommend** this option.

Option 4 - Create a new One World Event Entity *("One Event; One Organization")*

It is unquestionable that both the Federation and GLISA have, over their life spans, created loyal and, to a degree, overlapping constituencies. These constituencies have largely encompassed the LGBTQI communities in developed, and some might say "westernized", areas of the world. Nonetheless, neither organization fully engages with the global LGBTQI community.

A new entity, whose first external task would be to plan and deliver One World Event in 2022, would be more than a merger of the existing organization. In point of fact, a new One World Event entity would be the "home base", the "platform" for other organizations serving specific needs of the same global LGBTQI communities.

A One World Event entity would encompass issues related to sport, culture, and human rights for the global LGBTQI through the delivery of its signature quadrennial activity - "One World Event". In continuous preparation for this event, the One World Event entity would support and advocate participation in this event without barriers, whether it be for a footballer who cannot afford to join her team, or a community activist whose NGO has not funds to allow him to attend, or a local choral group looking for a welcoming audience to share the joy of song. All these constituencies would be the proper constituencies of the One World Event entity.

With respect to practical considerations, features **of the governance documents of both organizations** contain useful components of the new One World Event entity. But, to envelop the many LGBTQI constituencies not covered with the network of either organization, some modification would have to be incorporated into a new governing document. The drafting of a new set of By-laws and protocols would rely on current features and expand to reflect current law, global parameters, and new communities.

The need for an **inclusive and representative governing body** within the One World Event entity would not be significantly different in form from the current workings of either organization presently. However, representation of the various global communities/organizations, and presentation and pursuit of their issues, would need to be accommodated in whatever governing structure would be proposed.

The **history** of each organization would be protected and reflected in the workings of the One World Event entity as this would form the basis for any new governing

construct. Yet, the present limitations of each organization's histories would not solely dictate future directions. In other words, one can move forward with the best aspects and abandon less satisfactory circumstances.

There would be a moderate impact on **the external activities** of the new One World Event entity as it engaged with other associations, federations, agencies to reflect and assist these new constituencies.

Internal activities would be minimally effected as the new governing body expanded and reflected other new participating representatives. But common features of any such organization, such as officer positions, board functions, finance, record-keeping would remain constant.

The **presence of Continental Associations** would allow the new One World Event entity to reach directly into each continental geographic area to reach its members directly. This would immediately expand the scope of the delivery of information, programs, and services of the One World Event entity and form a wider base for One World Event participants.

There would be **minimal legal fees** as the resources of the One World Event entity assumed the resources of both organizations.

The process of **site selection and delivery** of One World Event would be a collaborative effort of the new participants. Since both organizations have similar selection processes and selection parameters, integration and enhancement of a single process would occur.

With respect to **revenue**, the One World Event entity would be the single recipient of One World Event resources, such as licensing fees, event income, and sponsorship. With respect to approaching sponsors, the new One World Event entity would offer an integrated vision encompassing three components, thus providing wider coverage for sponsors.

The **marketing and presentation** of the public face of the new One World Event entity would require additional communication focus and scope to inform the global LGBTQI of the development of this entity.

The One World Event entity would use the **combined staff** of the two founding organizations, thus expanding the reach of the various programs, services, and information currently offered by two different organizations. Also, with a single

multi-faceted global entity, it would be more reasonable for the entity to be able to approach various agencies in different national, state, and local governments around the world.

Lastly, the new One World Event entity is a direct reflection of the survey. More specifically, as stated by one respondent, "**one event; one organization**".

The Working Group recommends this option.

VI - GOVERNANCE OF ONE WE

The Musqueam First Nation, whose traditional territory includes much of the present city of Vancouver, British Columbia has a tradition of putting a nail outside the entrance to one's home. The purpose of the nail is to remind and encourage those who entered to "*hang any preconceived thoughts on a nail like this so that people who enter the space (do so) with an open mind and an open heart.*"

The reader is invited to apply this expectation to the following portions of the Report. The above considerations having been outlined, it was determined, both in Ljubljana and in the first report of the Working Group to their Boards, that a singular task of the Working Group was to scope out the possibility of a single entity that would be broad enough in scope to provide a "home" or a "safe meeting place" for the entire global LGBTTIQ community. At the same time, it would have to be agile enough to respond to immediate issues that might affect various LGBTTIQ constituencies within the larger community.

The Survey benefitted from a wide cross-section of responses, a heavy percentage of who (64%) had attended at least one global event and had done so multiple times. So these respondents could be said to have had a good understanding of the community members they had met at such events and of the events themselves. It could also be said that this audience was quite reasonably aware of the on-the-ground challenges of putting on a global event for the community and aware of the need to engage all sectors of the community in such an event.

While the Survey indicated the respondents were largely male age 30-60, the responses to questions were far-reaching, informed, varied and reflective of a wide range of issues with the global community. In short, those who completed the Survey on behalf of their member organization reflected a full range of issues within their organization. per the Survey's instructions. So one can reasonably say that the responses reflected a great many more individuals of different ages, of varied sexual presentations, with different preoccupations than just those of the chosen respondents.

As such, these were very knowledgeable and informed responses. So, in the playing of one's sport, discussions would have occurred about a team that was not able to attend the global event because they could not get a visa to leave their country. And individuals would have read about a state turning down the right to

same-sex marriage due to political pressure and not reflective of the equal rights of individuals. Similarly, individuals would be aware of artists whose art was unrecognized due to their orientation and not based on the visual appearance or sublime sound of their performance.

It was clear from the Survey results that individuals wanted a level of unity within the global GLBTTIQ community that does not presently exist. As the community comes out of the closet on different continents, in different cities and states, and in different guises, based on their own achievements, and on behalf of different issues, it does so with the anticipation that they will have a voice that will be heard not just in their own locale but globally. That capacity does not presently occur.

What follows in this Report is a framework for an organization - tentatively called a One World Event Entity ("One WE Entity") - that would reflect the various constituencies within the global community. The Entity would provide a "docking platform" for organizations and associations with an abiding interest in the issues of the global community but not the ability or interest to formally join an external organization. The Entity would also represent certain core values in its presentation and treatment of the community's issues and in its dealings with all stakeholders.

VII - ONE WE ENTITY (Summary Description)

1.) Mission and Principles

The purpose of The One WE Entity is to foster, support, and augment respect and understanding of gay, lesbian, transgender, bisexual, queer, two-spirited, and intersex individuals and their allies throughout the world and to engender respect and inclusion of these individuals across the global community through the organization and delivery of One World Event.

The mission of the One WE Entity is to promote diversity and equality through hosting a global One World Event using the mutual disciplines of Sport, Culture and Human Rights and to assist and support individuals and organizations to participate in One World Event.

One WE Entity's guiding principles include **P**articipation/ **P**ersonal Best, **R**espect, **I**nclusion, **D**iversity, and **E**mpowerment.

Consistent with the purpose, mission, and guiding principles, the One WE Entity commits to assuring that, in its internal operations and employment practices and in its professional relationships, as well as in the events for which it is responsible, there will be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, political belief, athletic/artistic ability, age, physical challenge, or health status.

2.) Fundamental Components

A.) Sport is an activity requiring skill, prowess, strategy, physical stamina, knowledge, and practice. Playing a sport is a demonstration of one's commitment to a healthy lifestyle, of one's determination to "do your best", and one's perseverance to continue to improve. Sport is inclusive of physical, mental, and developmental challenges, to the degree of the individual participating. Examples of some sports include, swimming, running, dance, tennis, bridge, skateboarding, caving, rowing, poker, golf, and others.

There is also a strong recommendation to create a Scholastic Division (under 25) with significantly reduced registration fees as a way to encourage younger members of the community to participate

B.) Culture is a demonstration of the creative capacity of individuals. Culture is

multi-faceted and consists of events such as Pride celebrations, choir festivals, film festivals, theater performances, visual exhibitions, graffiti art, musical performances, women's spaces and other such celebrations.

C.) Human Rights are the entitlements of individuals to sustain their dignity, integrity, and personal essence. Human rights are indivisible and universal and include cultural, social, economic, civil and political rights. Human rights also include individuals' sexual orientations, gender identities, gender expressions and bodily diversity.

3.) Administrative Components

A.) A Board of Directors is the elected and, in some instances, appointed council which manages and directs the One World Event Entity. This group of individuals represents the various communities within the global community, such as women, men, trans, youth, sports, culture, human rights, and geographic.

The Board would include the following positions: Co-Presidents (Male/Female), Treasurer, Secretary, and Directors for Ceremonies & Protocol, Communications, Culture, Development, External Affairs, Host Relations, Human Rights & Diversity, Internal Affairs, International Development, Marketing, Continental Associations (5), Membership, Operations, Site Selection, Technology and Volunteers, Officers-at-Large (3), and Executive Director. Not all of these positions are voting members of the Board. Descriptions of these positions are in the Appendix.

B.) An Executive Committee will undertake to manage the daily operational activities of the One WE Entity according to the directions of the Board of Directors. This Committee is comprised of the Co-Presidents, Secretary, Treasurer, Executive Director - Operations (non-voting), Director of Host Relations/Site Selection, Director of Human Rights and Diversity, two representatives of Continental Associations.

C.) Councils of the One WE governing body will reflect the Fundamental Components of Sport, Culture and Human Rights and are permanent aspects of the One World Event Entity. Each Council will have two Co-Chairs, will keep abreast of LGBTTIQ issues globally, and will report regularly. They will report to the Board of Directors and be expected to devise approaches to specific issues which affect the community. Councils will largely consist of representatives of member organizations but may have informed others as participants.

An example of these issues might be how one can practise one's religion as a LGBTTIQ person with representatives of religious governing bodies as participants, or discrimination in applying for sports funding in a particular country with representatives from that country's government funding agency, or exclusion from performance opportunities for LGBTTIQ individuals by an "official association" with individuals from performing arts unions.

D.) Commissions are non-binding bodies created by the One WE governing body to address significant concerns, issues or matters that warrant specific attention, such as the implementation of a significant program or service within the One WE entity. Commissions will exist for a single purpose and will consist of individuals with expertise in that area, whether from member organizations or interested other organizations. Once that purpose has been achieved, the Commission will disband or seek re-commissioning for continuing work based on its findings.

An example of a Commission's scope might be engaging philanthropic organizations to support an anti-cyber-bullying programs for youth, which might involve members of PFLAG, Queerbio.com, the European Union, and major police organizations. Or establishing a "*speakers' bureau*" of well-known competitors to address concerns to the public. Or a "*preferred performers inventory*" of LGBTTIQ artists to provide performance opportunities for these artists.

E.) Committees are non-binding bodies created within the One WE governing body and are chaired by a member of the Executive Committee or an Executive Committee appointee. Committees are tasked with a single, clear, time-limited responsibility and can recommend motions that have been passed at the Committee level to the three Councils and Board of Directors. Committee would most often be comprised of individuals of member organizations as committees largely deal with proprietary information, such as finances, contractual discussions with host cities, and internal governance tools.

Such committees could include Site Selection (process and vote on a future One World Event host), Host Relations and Production (establishing relationships for the delivery of One World Event), Finance (monitoring and assessing One World Event entity finances), Governance (devising revisions to the founding charter to reflect new situations).

F.) Caucuses are a non-binding consortium of individuals from within each of the

three Councils of the One WE governing body that can address issues concerning specific constituencies, such as women, elders, trans, youth, disabled, etc.). Caucuses are informally constituted and are able to put forth motions to one of the three Councils before these motions come to the full governing body for a vote. If it passes with a simple majority by the Caucus, it will then go to the Board of Directors for a vote.

For example, the Youth Caucuses might address the goal of providing a generous scholarship program to subsidize you to attend One World Event. The Trans Caucus might undertake global distribution of the Canadian Labour Congress's manual on addressing trans issues at the workplace. The Elder's Caucus might assist in assuring age-friendly sports events at One World Event, such as stationary rowing, bridge/poker, transportation and accommodation.

4.) REGULATORY COMPONENTS

These aspects of the One World Event Entity address the various procedural and protocol details necessary for the orderly operations of the organization. These issues include the frequency and means of meetings, such as use of electronic avenues, recourse tools when distracting conduct issues arise, such as a means to address complaints of members' misconduct, modality for the annual meeting, including the requirement for individual presence during a One World Event, and other similar processes.

An example of these features has been incorporated into incorporated into a "One World Event Charter" in the Appendix of this Report.

VIII - PROCESS TO ACHIEVE ONE WE (Entity and Event)

The One WE WG strongly recommends an inclusive meeting of Board members from the FGG and GLISA and other interested stakeholders to be held in conjunction with EGLSF's EuroGames 2015 and IGLA World Championships in Stockholm Sweden (05-08 August 2015). We anticipate the necessary discussions to begin the One WE process can be accomplished in two and one half days of face-to-face meetings.

The best way to bring about the creation of a new governing body from the two existing bodies is to assemble as many of the Board members from the two organizations in a location where there will be a critical mass of participants. Not only does this allow us to tap into a larger potential source of attendees, but it also promotes the work of the One WE Transition Commission. It also provides sufficient time from January 2015 to organize and conduct the necessary virtual and face-to-face Town Hall meetings to engage and inform the global community.

The first day (Saturday 08 August) would include registration and establishment of protocols for the meeting to be conducted. It also allows for the Site Selection Committee and Transition Commission to make presentations as a way to brief the attendees on progress to date. The presentations can also be made available online at a password-safe website for others to view electronically.

The second day (Sunday 09 August) would be a full day of meetings, starting with Roll Call and General Session. By late morning, breakout sessions would occur to revise any governing documents and draft motions to be brought before the meeting as a whole for adoption and ratification on the third and final day.

The revised documents will be made available online at a password-safe website for others to view and provide input electronically.

The third day (Monday 10 August) would have early morning sessions to review electronic comments or requests prior to motions being put forth to the meeting as a whole. Once all motions are ready, the meeting will reconvene for discussion and voting purposes.

Each motion will be put forth and voted upon. Following the adoption and ratification of the proposed Articles of Incorporation and By-laws, steps for election of the Board of the new One WE entity would be established.

IX - TRANSITION PROCESS

- to be identified Spring 2015
- to consist of an appropriate number of members appointed by our two organizations
- consideration will be given to those who have served on the 1WE Working Group in good standing
- additional consideration will be to those with special skill sets deemed necessary
- appointees can be from outside either organization's Board of Directors
- to create an Advisory Board to assist with certain legal and business matters

- Tasks of the Commission will be:
 - Set up an inclusive meeting in 2015 with representation from both Boards as well as representatives from other interested parties
 - Develop the framework for the 1WE governance
 - Oversee a process to:
 - name the Organization and Event (via public submissions with online voting)
 - identify possible locations for incorporation
 - undertake stakeholder consultations
 - scope the criteria for Membership
 - outline the dimensions of Sport, Culture and Human Rights for 1WE
- to replace itself with the new 1WE governing body within 2 years

Considerations to the Transition Process from the 1WE Working Group

We recognize the importance of the Continental Associations and request that the Transition process have a consultation with each to provide input on what they feel their role should be within the 1WE governing body.

X - SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE

- to be established no later than May 2015
- Four individuals (two from FGG and two from GLISA International) will oversee the work to create a viable selection process that is transparent and democratic.
- 1WE bid process will result in the selection of a host organization to produce a global quadrennial sport-culture-human rights event with the first such event to occur in 2022; and every four years hence.
- The final selection of this event will occur five years prior to its presentation, in 2017, and every four years hence.
- The scope, elements and timeline for this Site Selection process will be determined by the Site Selection Commission. GLISA International and FGG Boards need to approve this plan prior to its presentation and approval at the World Congress.
- Present a Site Selection process to the World Congress for approval and implementation
- Process to be completed by 01 October 2015 for 1WE Site Selection process to commence immediately.

Considerations to the Site Selection Committee from the 1WE Working Group

We request the Final bid presentation process be recorded and immediately rebroadcast on a website for viewing by those not in physical attendance at the Site Selection presentation location.

They will have 24 hours in which to view these presentations and submit questions for the Question-And-Answer period of the Final presentations

They will have a shorter window of opportunity to register their vote on line (certified viewers will need to receive an individual PIN to access the recorded presentations and final ballot).

If the Bid process schedule is unable to allow for the final Site Selection location to occur with World OutGames IV: Miami 2017, then consideration needs to be given to include an element of the Bid process to be accessible to those attending World OutGames IV.

XI - TIMELINE

- 15 January** Cologne Report (First Draft) sent to both Boards
- 25 January** GLISA Board Meeting (+ Working Group Members for presentation)
- 7 February** FGG Board Meeting (+ Working Group Members for presentation)
- 15 February** 1WE WG Meeting to review the Cologne Report based on the contributions of both Boards and send out Second Draft
- 22 February** GLISA Board Meeting to consider the Cologne Report (Second Draft)
- 18 March** FGG Board Meeting to consider the Cologne Report (Second Draft)
- 15 March** 1WE WG Meeting to review the Cologne Report (Second Draft) based on the contributions of both Boards and send out Final Draft
- 29 March** GLISA Board Meeting to approve the Cologne Report (Final Draft)
- 12 April** FGG Board Meeting to approve the Cologne Report (Final Draft)
- 26 April & 6 May** FGG and GLISA ratify the Memorandum of Understanding to create:
- Transition Commission (XX members)
- Site Selection Committee (4 members)
- June** Site Selection Committee names considered
Transition Commission names provided to Boards
- July** Site Selection Committee names announced, work begins

	Transition Commission individuals contacted; chairs decided
June-September	Transition Commission and Site Selection Commission meetings
August 2015	GLISA Annual Delegate Congress to ratify progress and direction
05 - 08 Aug	EuroGames 2015 and IGLA Championships, Stockholm
August	One WE Transition Commission Meeting, Stockholm
October 2015	FGG Annual General Assembly (Limerick) to ratify progress and direction
March 2016	Incorporation of One World Event as a non-government organization; election of Officers of the Board.
April 2016	Acceptance of Letters of Intent to Bid for One World Event 2022
April 2017	Formal establishment and registration of One WE entity

Additional Considerations to the Timeline from the 1WE Working Group

- Conduct an international online campaign/survey in a multi-step process, asking our constituents and/or the community at large what the name of the One World Event governing body should be named.
- Conduct an international online campaign/survey in a multi-step process, asking our constituents and/or the community at large what the quadrennial One World Event incorporating sport, culture and human rights should be named.

XII - SUMMARY

Change is not an easy thing to accomplish. But when it is inevitable, one must make bold decisions to advance our mission without any less regard for the core principles that have guided this work since the day Tom Waddell first put his idea into action.

Over the course of the next weeks and months, the contents of this document will be reviewed and revised and will serve as the basis for a formal Memo of Understanding that will enact the next step in the process of reunification. If there are any elements various members of either Board feel have been omitted, we humbly regret our error and look forward to including such elements and discussing with both Boards.

We realize that there are still many steps ahead before we can accomplish One World Event in 2022. There is also the realization that the One WE organization, should it be determined a new entity be formed, would be functioning simultaneously as GLISA International and the FGG for a period of time. And, although their function may alter dramatically, the creation of a new entity to oversee the production of the quadrennial event does not necessarily mean the related visions of either the FGG or GLISA needs to disappear entirely. Those are discussions each Board will have to consider prior to signing the Memo of Understanding.

The One WE Working Group would once again like to thank the Boards of GLISA and the FGG for entrusting us with the opportunity to present this proposal to create a One World Event for the global LGBTQI community and we look forward to continue serving our global community.