



# EuroGames 2015

## Stockholm Investigation Report

January 2016

**Prepared by:**

Name: Annette Wachter

Title: Female Co-President

Email: [annette.wachter@eglsf.info](mailto:annette.wachter@eglsf.info)

Name: Klaus Heusslein

Title: Male Co-President

Email: [klaus.heusslein@eglsf.info](mailto:klaus.heusslein@eglsf.info)

Name: Edwin Westenberg

Title: Treasurer

Email: [edwin.westenberg@eglsf.info](mailto:edwin.westenberg@eglsf.info)

Name: Tamara Tien

Title: General Secretary

Email: [tamara.tien@eglsf.info](mailto:tamara.tien@eglsf.info)

Name: Jon Landa

Title: Board Member

Email: [jon.landa@eglsf.info](mailto:jon.landa@eglsf.info)

Name: John Ryan

Title: Board Member

Email: [john.ryan@eglsf.info](mailto:john.ryan@eglsf.info)

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Main Report</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	Aims & Objectives	6
5.2	Time and Sequence	6
5.3	Incident Descriptions	8
5.4	Findings	16
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Legacy &amp; Lasting Impact</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>22</b>
9.1	Statement from the President of the organising committee	22
9.2	Statement from the EGLSF Board	23
9.3	The EuroGames Committee	23

## 1 Background

During the Annual General Assembly in Antwerp, 2013, the delegates voted for Stockholm as host of the 2015 EuroGames. The board of the EGLSF prepared a contract about running this event and negotiated with the host committee.

The board visited Stockholm from May 31<sup>st</sup> - June 2<sup>nd</sup> 2013 and had meetings with the organisers and representatives of the Stockholm tourist board. Stockholm gave a presentation of the proposed venues, which had been already confirmed.

The EGLSF board received quarterly reports and from 2015 these reports were monthly. The board met face to face every three months and also held Skype meetings with the hosts.

A final meeting to receive a last update on the EuroGames from the Sports Manager of EuroGames 2015 has been organised by the board on the August 4<sup>th</sup> 2015 in Stockholm. The board of the EGLSF had received complaints prior to the EuroGames were addressed to the sport director of the organizing committee. No major issues were reported to the board during this meeting.

A new format for the reports to the board of the EGLSF was developed, which partly followed the old format. The two boards could see that the progress was as expected. In these reports the board monitored:

- Major activities
- Sports program
- Infrastructure
- Security concept
- Sponsorship
- Culture/Events
- Public Relations
- Information technologies and volunteer recruitment
- Marketing
- Financial planning

The EuroGames XV were held in Stockholm from the 5<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> of August 2015. There were 4,450 registered participants with 254,905 spectators who visited Stockholm in this period.

The EuroGames in Stockholm offered 26 sports including a cultural and political programme that ran in conjunction with the sport programme.

The (Future of) EuroGames committee (Appendix 9.3) consisting of the following members Lou Manders (EuroGames 2005/JBF), Hans van Dop (EuroGames 2011), Philip Houtermans (Active Company) and Markus Zittlau (Dusseldorf Dolphins) was established during the AGA in 2015. After the EuroGames in Stockholm the EuroGames committee and was requested by the board to be involved in the investigation committee. The board suggested the EuroGames committee as two members of that committee were in Stockholm during the games and have a vast array of experience in the organization of EuroGames.

The EuroGames committee declined due to the fact that they were mentioned in the comments concerning the EGS 15 and advised the board to organize the independent committee with experienced outsiders e.g. former EGLSF board members and former EuroGames organizers (not being EGC members). Furthermore the EuroGames committee’s task is to formulate a strategy on the future of EuroGames.

The EGC also told the board that due to lack of time, they will focus on this topic and will make use of the outcome of the investigation committee.

Due to the lack of time, the board was not in a position to look for possible candidates who could join an independent investigation committee.

The EGLSF board was made up of the following members over the past 3 years.

Female Co-President	Annette Wachter	2015-present
Male Co-President	Klaus Heusslein	2013-2015
Female Co-President	Armelle Mazé	2013-2014
Treasurer	Edwin Westenberg	2015-present
Treasurer	Tim van Hoydonck	2013-2015
General Secretary	Annette Wachter	2013-2015
General Secretary	Tamara Tien	2015-present
Board Member	Jon Landa	2011-present
Board Member	Christiana Devana	2014-2015
Board Member	Tamara Tien	2013-2015
Board Member	Dániel Waliduda	2013-2015
Board Member	John Ryan	2015-present

## 2 Summary

During the EuroGames of 2015, which were held in Stockholm, Sweden, there were a number of complaints messaged to the board of the EGLSF and to the host committee from the participants of the games. These complaints consisted of concerns

over the age groups in track and field and running, lack of information regarding the running of a number of tournaments, lack of starting lists for the swimming competition and the cancellation of the triathlon event. These complaints were received from the 31<sup>st</sup> of July to the 8<sup>th</sup> of August.

The board of the EGLSF, who is the Licensor of the EuroGames, decided to investigate each one of these complaints in order to come to a complete understanding as to why so many issues occurred. A dedicated email address was created so that participants could email their experiences directly to the board, and any other comments found on social media platforms were also recorded. From the conclusions drawn from this investigation the board has put in place recommendations for future EuroGames host committees to ensure that the games will be the best possible experience for each participant.

### **3 Conclusion**

During the EuroGames XV 2015, the vast majority of events ran smoothly and without any incidents. Just before and during the games there were complaints regarding some of the events and ceremonies brought to the attention of the board of the EGLSF and the organising committee. When incidents were made clear to the board and the hosting committee, they tried to reorganise events whenever possible along with the help of some of the participating athletes. This was not possible in all circumstances.

The reports that were provided to the EGLSF board prior to the games did not contain any indicators that would have caused concern for the board. There were many issues with the communication lines between the participants, tournament organisers and the organising committee, which resulted in many of the complaints being sent to the board of the EGLSF and to the organising committee.

One of the main issues with these EuroGames was the lack of a tournament handbook that the host committee could have used to organise the tournaments in a way that benefitted the participants by giving them the best possible experience. As no such handbook ever existed in the history of the EGLSF there were many assumptions made which should not have been. Participation expectations were clearly managed in a number of events, but in the events that caused the most issues, expectations were not managed.

As a result of the findings from this report the board have put in place a number of recommendations and practices for future EuroGames hosting committees, which should prevent any of these incidents from happening again.

### **4 Recommendations**

The board of the EGLSF recommend that the following steps be taken prior and during the next EuroGames to ensure that the participants get the best possible experience.

- Keep the focus of the EuroGames on Sport
- Develop guidelines and checklists for each sport, but also for the opening and closing ceremonies
- Establish a Directory of Sports Specialists, who will work with the host sports directors.
- Appoint 2 liaison board members to assist the host committee.
- All schedules of the tournaments should be published at least two weeks before the commencement of the games.
- All communication should be primarily via email to the participants.
- Specific sport questions delivered to the specific sports director.
- Strong WIFI at the accreditation.
- Participants' passes prepared per surname and pre printed.
- Information desks at accreditation per sport.
- Proper signage for venues throughout the games.
- If there is a shortage of medals during the games give the option to print a certificate for the participant.
- A short survey from the EGLSF to all participants after the EuroGames.

## 5 Main Report

### 5.1 Aims & Objectives

The investigation was designed to get to the root causes of the problems that occurred during the games. We intend, by addressing these root causes, to prevent any similar and related incidents happening in the future of the EuroGames.

### 5.2 Time and Sequence

Friday the 31<sup>st</sup> of July the EGLSF board received some emails about the problems with Track and Field and Water polo. The board contacted the host committee directly and asked for clarification, which was not received.

Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> August, the board of the EGLSF met with the sports director who updated us about the status quo of the sports program. The board requested that the age groups be changed to groups of 5 years in accordance with master's track and field recommendations. It was confirmed that the events could not be rescheduled due to lack of time.

The water polo concerns were answered by the confirmation that a specialist had been contacted and they agreed that the competition could be run the way it was scheduled if all teams were agreeing.

During our board meeting (August 4<sup>th</sup>) we received information that swimmers were scratched from the heats. On Tuesday evening the organisers of the EuroGames had a meeting with the Swedish Swimming Federation, the IGLA and the two hosting swimming clubs to solve this technical problem. At this point the board offered our assistance and asked if we were required to attend this meeting. We were assured that our presence was not necessary as it was a technical issue.

We, as a board, decided to be present at the swimming venue the following morning. There we met with the Swedish Swimming Federation and the IGLA and tried to solve the problems which occurred.

Over the next 2 days we checked out the rest of the 26 sports on offer, and we found out that some sports were experiencing issues. The board visited the venues and locations that were experiencing such issues to see if they could be rectified. When problems occurred at the various locations we tried to solve these problems with the sports organisers and rescheduled events when it was possible to do so.

The board members visited the location and venues of the following sports: Bowling, Floorball, Badminton, Cycling, Handball, Table Tennis, Basketball, Football, Volleyball, Petanque, Dancing, Rugby, Swimming, Water polo, Synchronized Swimming, Diving, Track and Field, Running and Ultra Marathon.

Thursday the 6<sup>th</sup> of August, the board had an emergency meeting with the organiser of the EuroGames. The board member who visited the cycling event noticed that there had been some safety issues. From these concerns it was evident that this will effect the cycling competition of the triathlon the following day as well. During the meeting the water quality was mentioned as a possible risks to the health of the athletes. At the end of this meeting the decision was made to cancel the triathlon and to inform the participants immediately.

On Friday the 7<sup>th</sup> of August we received many complaints about the cancellation of the triathlon. We found that the situation was unacceptable, so we sent out a statement to our members, which was then also posted on our website and on a number of social media platforms. [See appendix 9.2]

It was decided that these incidents had to be investigated so we invited our members and non-members to email their comments and experiences to [egs@eglsf.info](mailto:egs@eglsf.info). This was a dedicated email address setup to capture all experiences participants had during the games

Saturday the 8<sup>th</sup> of August the 2015 EuroGames were officially closed.

The EGLSF requested that the participants actively mail their experiences to the dedicated email address. Over the next three weeks we received many emails, comments, experiences, complaints along with positive feedback from participants, visitors and volunteers.

The EuroGames committee was contacted to assist with the investigation, but declined citing that they could not engage as they were personally mentioned in the comments, and that it was not apart of the strategy of the EGC.

The EGLSF board compiled a questionnaire from all the emails and social media posts that were received, which was then sent to the Stockholm committee. A face-to-face meeting was scheduled for the 21<sup>st</sup> November in order to finalise the findings of

the investigation. The organising committee gave a response and from this the board returned to Stockholm for the face-to-face meeting with them to clarify some outstanding questions.

### **5.3 Incident Descriptions**

#### **5.3.1 Badminton**

The badminton competition was run in collaboration with the National Swedish Badminton Federation and according to their rules. They organised the tournament in a competitive way, which resulted in a knock out system.

The sports manager for the badminton tournament rescheduled the program due to the many requests of the participants. As a result of this rescheduling the tournament games commenced one hour earlier. There was a lack of communication coming from the sports director who was asked to notify the participants that the updated schedule would be on the badminton website. This did not happen, which resulted in some players not being made aware of the new schedule and thus missing their games.

There were also issues with participants not being able to locate the venue due to lack of signage. The venue provided only limited facilities for the number of participants and for that reason the Stockholm committee had rented the hockey venue next to the badminton hall available for players.

The tournament was originally scheduled to run over two days, but due to the increased number of participants the organisers changed it to a three-day event. As many of the participants had already purchased flights to leave Sweden, the organisation returned the competition to a two-day tournament.

#### **5.3.2 Basketball**

Before the basketball tournament had started the participants asked for two courts instead of the one that was allocated.

It was difficult to find a venue with two courts and within budget. The organising team confirmed that they could run a tournament with 12 teams in two days on one court.

The referees and the officials were in the responsibility of the hosting club, and therefore the organising committee had no input into who was selected. The organising committee also noted that they expected that all officials were properly trained and knowledgeable in their chosen sports.



### 5.3.3 Bowling

The bowling tournament was organised by the director of the arena. Normally there are five classes in a bowling tournament, but due to the low number of registered participants for the three classes (C, D and E), the host committee merged these three classes into two classes.

There was no separate women's competition because there is no gender-documented difference in the playing ability of bowling between male and female participants.

### 5.3.4 Bridge

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.5 Cycling

The organising committee secured a permit of the closure of one lane for the cycling event. That is normal procedure for an event with 28 participants in the centre of Stockholm. There was an acknowledgement of a short fall in the number of volunteers required for this event by the sports director. The amount of volunteers on the road made it difficult to guarantee the safety of the participants and the volunteers themselves during the event.

Due to the safety concerns of the participants and volunteers the competition was changed from road race to a time trial format. To reorganise the event from a road race to a time trial format required extra time being needed to ensure the minimum safety measures were addressed. This in turn resulted in a delay of ninety minutes before the new format time trial road race could start.

### 5.3.6 Dance

There were complaints regarding some audience members who showed up at the dance venue on the Saturday evening only to be informed that the competition had taken place earlier during the day. This was a result of the organisers not putting a specific time into the ticketing system, which resulted in a default time being printed, 8pm. There was no time entered into

the ticketing system as the organisers knew that it was not possible to specifically state a time, as is due to the way the competitions are run throughout the day.

The correct times of the finals were available on the Facebook page. All tickets for the finals were refunded.

### 5.3.7 Diving

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.8 Field Hockey

There was one email received by the board regarding this tournament. The email was positive and thanked the organisers for a well-run tournament.

### 5.3.9 Floorball

There was one email received by the board regarding this tournament. The email was positive and thanked the organisers for a well-run tournament.

### 5.3.10 Football

There were a few emails received by the board regarding the men's tournament. These emails contained positive comments on the excellent facilities, good organization and very good communication with the organisers.

The board did receive one complaint from a woman's team, who pointed out that although the tournament was ran in the correct way, they felt that they could have played more games during the competition.

### 5.3.11 Golf

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.12 Handball

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.13 Petanque

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.14 Rugby

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.15 Running (10k and 5k)

The running events were organised by the Stockholm Front Runners. They organised the events without age groups as they normally run events in this manner. The organising committee asked if it would be possible to create age groups for these 2 events and Stockholm Front Runners declined to change the program. Therefore the running events were completed without any age groups.

### 5.3.16 Softball

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.17 Squash

The tournament was run in a similar way as the badminton, in that it favored the competitive athlete. There were a few comments regarding this but there were extra games scheduled in order to facilitate those participants who wanted to play more.

### 5.3.18 Swimming

The swimming tournament registered nine hundred swimmers, and therefore the organising committee contacted ILGA to confirm with them if the pool time they have reserved would be enough to run the tournament. IGLA recommended that pool time of three days with five-hour sessions per day and one afternoon session would be enough.

The Swedish Swimming Federation in cooperation with two local swimming clubs ran the tournament. The two local swimming clubs had previous experience in organising national and international swimming competitions. The host clubs provided all the officials and they were certified to officiate in accordance with FINA requirements.

The first issue concerning the swimming competition was the lack of starting lists being made available and that some swimmers were scratched from the lists once they were published. This was due to human error, which resulted in the incorrect times being entered into the system. When these times were calculated correctly into the system there was not enough pool time purchased to accommodate the competition. This was the reason of the scratches being made in the first place. The Stockholm organisers said that following FINA rules in master competition if time exceeds swimmers could be scratched.

The starting list was corrected once the error was noticed and the scratched swimmers were reinstated into the heat lists.

An incident occurred where some heats were started from the wall and not on the blocks. This was an error of the race official from the Swedish Swimming Federation. After realizing that this was unacceptable they attempted to contact all swimmers who were affected by this start. Not all participants could be contacted and therefore the decision was made to leave the times as recorded in the heats.

Swimmers who had entered the 800m and 1,500m freestyle were asked to decide between competing in one event or the other. This resulted in many complaints, and therefore the Swedish Swimming Federation, IGLA and the EGLSF had a meeting at the venue where they tried to come to an arrangement that would be agreeable to the organisers and the participants. The meeting resulted in the decision that the swimmers could enter both events if they wanted to. Negotiations then took place between the volunteers and the organisers of the tournament to purchase extra pool time in order to complete the schedule. Many swimmers were content with this outcome and were happy to compete in both long distance events.

The EGLSF received a petition from a number of swim teams in Europe regarding the scoring system for the EuroGames and the IGLA championships. This petition requested that the EuroGames should follow the governing rules of the EGLSF, create

different scoring for the European swim teams as it is a European event, award the European swimmers as it is a European event, and urge IGLA to award the swimmers by a different system as they cannot use the European system. The board of the EGLSF feels that the delegates should discuss this petition at the AGA (Glasgow, March, 2016), and we can all come to a decision as to how to deal with this situation if it arises in the future.

### 5.3.19 Synchronized Swimming

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.20 Table Tennis

The registration numbers for the table tennis event were below the expected number. The decision was made by the organising hosts to combine the divisions into one group. This resulted in stronger players competing against weaker players, which was seen as an unfair competition.

### 5.3.21 Tennis

There were no emails received by the board regarding this tournament. As there are no known issues to address, we are therefore unable to report on the experiences of the participants of the event.

### 5.3.22 Track and Field

The local LGBT track and field association along with the host club agreed that the age groups would be ten years. This decision was made in order to give athletes a more competitive event since some competitions were not completely full. There was a lack of communication from the host club to the organising committee regarding this information, and this resulted in participants not fully understanding the lack of five-year age groups. The host club was responsible for providing the officials at the venue.

The organising committee did not realise that the track and field competition had to follow the master rules having 5 years age groups.

The issue with the overlapping scheduling of the track and field competition with the closing ceremony was a result of that participants showing up late and splitting competitions into gender categories.

The result of the women 400m relay was not announced. This was a mistake of the organisers.

### 5.3.23 Triathlon

After the cycling event it came to the boards attention that there could be possible safety issues for the triathlon participants during the event. The decision was made by the organising committee to cancel the triathlon because of this safety risks. The organisers added there was also algae bloom in the water around the triathlon-swimming course that could be a health risk for the athletes. This report has been requested from the Stockholm committee, but it has not yet been received.

The EGLSF board consulted with experts regarding the safety issues and possible risks of running the triathlon under these circumstances. With the information we received from these persons, a request for more volunteers was made to the organising committee. There were 25 more volunteers then allocated to the triathlon event.

The board was still concerned with the safety of the participants and had more unanswered questions regarding the timing devices, entry/exit points, bike racks, lifeguards and volunteers. A meeting was requested after the civic reception to discuss these issues with the organising committee. During this meeting the organising committee decided to cancel the event.

An alternative plan was never organised, as it was never thought of that the event could be cancelled at the last minute.

The organisation committee reimbursed all triathlon athletes regardless if they had participated in other sporting event.

### 5.3.24 Ultra-Marathon

As a result of logistics there was a complaint about some winners not having received their medals on the day of the event. The Stockholm organisers have sent the medals to the athletes afterwards.

### 5.3.25 Volleyball

The organisers wanted to have the volleyball tournament in one venue to offer the participants a unique experience. The organisers passed the initial inspection and approved it for competition. Upon a second inspection it was highlighted that the floor was inadequate, the distances between courts were not wide enough, separation nets or curtains were missing along with the antennas. The player refused to compete under these conditions and therefore the games were cancelled for the day. As a result of these issues, two members from Vorspiel Berlin rearranged the volleyball competition into a two-day event at different locations around Stockholm. The City of Stockholm and the Stockholm organisers supported this decision. The tournament took place and the players were satisfied with this outcome.

### 5.3.26 Water polo

The issues with the water polo tournament began at the registration phase. There were a number of clubs who entered more players than permitted for one team, which resulted in two teams representing the club. In order to accommodate these extra teams the organising committee wanted to include these players, which resulted in an overpopulated tournament. The original tournament of 12 teams increased to 16. This resulted in teams having to shorten the time in the pool for each game. The tournament also had to run late on the Friday evening and commence early on the Saturday morning.

The host club highlighted the overpopulation issue with the sports director, but they received no response.

### 5.3.27 General Remarks

The EGLSF also received many comments, questions and complaints that were not sport related. This section contains these points.

- **Poor or no communication**  
There were a number of complaints regarding the lack or no communication coming from the host clubs or the host committee. Participants felt frustrated about the lack of information they received from the relevant parties. Information about the marshaling area for the opening ceremony was confusing or just lacking. Many athletes did not know if they should march with their club/team or country.
- **Poor logistics**  
The poorly planned logistical requirement resulted in a number of venues not receiving their volunteer t-shirts. This caused confusion at some of the venues where it was difficult to identify key volunteers.
- **Accreditation**  
Accreditation was frustrating as the WIFI was slow or did not work as expected. This resulted in time delays in participants being able to register. There was also a lack of sports managers to answer some questions that the participants had regarding changes to scheduling.
- **The €50 visitor package**  
The cost of the visitor package was questioned. The organising committee confirmed that the visitor package included the information for the week, entry to the Pink Flamingo, entry to museums, the final of the same sex dance finals and other smaller items.

- **Merchandising products**

The merchandising company, which made the t-shirts, sent the incorrect sizes, which resulted in most of the items being returned and the correct sizes being sent on at a later stage. The company also failed to deliver the hats. All orders of the t-shirts were filled. If the t-shirt was not collected during the EuroGames it was mailed to the home address of the customer.
- **Signage**

There were a number of venues without proper and clear signage, which resulted in some participants missing games or matches. It was the responsibility of the sports managers to ensure that all venues were clearly marked. The closing ceremony was also poorly sign posted resulting in many participants and visitors missing the event or arriving late.
- **Volunteers**

There were 400 volunteers assisting at the EuroGames. Out of the 400, 250 were paid by the city of Stockholm, as they were taking part in a summer work program. They were 17-19 years of age. The volunteers received a general training program, and some assisted during the Pride festival the previous week.
- **Hosted Housing**

Hosted housing is not a requirement of the organising committee, however when outreach programs are offered they should be of a minimum standard. There were complaints regarding security of the dorms and the lack of bedding at the dorms.

## 5.4 Findings

- 1) Participant's expectations were not clearly managed as to how some of the tournaments would be organised.
- 2) As there was only one Sports director communication between the organising committee and the participants there was a severe drop in the channels between the different parties. This resulted in frustration and confusion in many instances.
- 3) Any issues the organising committee were experiencing prior to the opening of the EuroGames were trying to be resolved. As there were no clear guidelines, the time required to solve these issues had ran out and ended up being unresolved.
- 4) In the sports where there were LGBTQ clubs organising the events there were none to very few complaints due to knowledge of what was expected from the community and the events were organised according to those expectations.
- 5) In some sporting events, the amount of volunteers required were miscalculation and this resulting in a short fall.
- 6) The application used to create the dance tickets should have been tested without adding in a specific time. The default time was set to 20:00, which resulted in a few people turning up to the venue when the event was already over.



- 7) There was no duathlon offered as an alternative competition due to the fact that it was never foreseen that the event would be cancelled.
- 8) Due to a lack of guidelines and rulebooks available, some measurements of courts and facilities for events were inadequate for the required sports. This resulted in cancellations and postponements of some events.
- 9) In an event where registration was low, the organisers had to combine groups, which resulted in some unfair competition where the stronger players had to play weaker players.
- 10) Logistical planning was not properly thought out, which resulted in some of the volunteers not receiving their t-shirts and some participants not receiving their medals on the day of their finals.
- 11) Lack of proper signage resulted in many of the participants unable to locate venues, miss their games and end up getting lost.
- 12) Test runs of the data export could have prevented the problems with the swimming scheduling and heat lists.
- 13) The lack of a protocol procedure for ceremonies resulted in a chaotic and non-participative event.
- 14) Registration did not close once capacity was reached in some events. This had a negative impact on the tournaments, such as shorted time, and faster turnaround of games.

## 6 Conclusions

During the EuroGames XV 2015, the vast majority of events ran smoothly and without any incidents. Just before and during the games there were complaints regarding some of the events and ceremonies brought to the attention of the board of the EGLSF and the organising committee. When incidents were made clear to the board and the hosting committee, they tried to reorganise events whenever possible along with the help of some of the participating athletes. This was not possible in all circumstances.

The reports that were provided to the EGLSF board prior to the games did not contain any indicators that would have caused concern for the board. There were many issues with the communication lines between the participants, tournament organisers and the organising committee, which resulted in many of the complaints being sent to the board of the EGLSF and to the organising committee.

One of the main issues with these EuroGames was the lack of a tournament handbook that the host committee could have used to organise the tournaments in a way that benefitted the participants by giving them the best possible experience. As no such handbook ever existed in the history of the EGLSF there were many assumptions made which should not have been. Participation expectations were clearly managed in a number of events, but in the events that caused the most issues, expectations were not managed.

As a result of the findings from this report the board have put in place a number of recommendations and practices for future EuroGames hosting committees, which should prevent any of these incidents from happening again.

## 7 Recommendations

The EGLSF board recommends that the following steps have to be taken prior and during the next EuroGames to ensure that the participants get the best possible experience.

### 7.1.1 Keep the focus of the EuroGames on Sport

This will ensure that the core pillar of sports participation remains the main focus of the EuroGames

### 7.1.2 Develop guidelines and checklists for each sport, including the opening and closing ceremonies

The creation of a set of handbooks for each sport would be beneficial to all future host committees. These handbooks will contain a set of guidelines and checklists that the host committee can use in the preparation of the games. These handbooks will also ensure that participant expectations are met. A short explanation of how the tournament will be run should also be made available to participants during the registration stage.

### 7.1.3 Establish a Directory of Sports Specialists, who will work with the host sports directors.

Establishing a Directory of Sports Specialists will assist the organising committees with any questions or queries they may have regarding the organisation and running of this multisport tournament. These specialists will be from member clubs who have a proven track record of being knowledgeable in their chosen sport. This role will be purely an advisory one, and they will have no involvement in the running of the tournament.

### 7.1.4 Appoint 2 liaison board members to assist the host committee.

The board of the EGLSF has appointed 2 instead of only 1 liaison board members for future EuroGames. There will be one primary liaison and one secondary assistant liaison. This is to guarantee the continuity of any tasks or requests in the run up to the games.

### 7.1.5 All schedules of the tournaments should be published at least two weeks before the commencement of the games.

Since the registration of the tournament closes many weeks before the opening of the games the schedules and venues of all the events could be published at least two weeks in advance of the EuroGames. This will give participants the relevant information regarding timing and locations of their sports. The participants may then choose to print the details of their venues, transport and event timetable prior to them arriving in the host city.

### 7.1.6 All communication should be primarily via email to the participants.

In order to ensure that all participants who are affected by any last minute changes to their schedules will be notified in a proper manner. Relying on social media platforms is not appropriate for scheduling updates, as many participants do not have access to the Internet at the venues. All updates should also be printed and posted at the venue locations to give everyone the possibility of being notified of any changes to scheduling.

### **7.1.7 Specific sport questions delivered to the specific sports director.**

All specific questions directed at the sports director of each sport should be properly registered and forwarded to the relevant person. This will ensure that no issues prior to the games or during the events will go unanswered.

### **7.1.8 Strong WIFI at the accreditation venue.**

Upon arrival at the accreditation venue it was clear that participants who forgot to print out their registration needed WIFI to download the relevant details from their email. Due to the large number of people trying to access their accounts the WIFI did not work as expected. This caused further delays with the accreditation process.

### **7.1.9 Participants prepared passes per surname.**

The setup of the accreditation was based on the participant having a unique code, and with this code their registration could be completed. As many participants did not have this unique code with them it resulted in many users trying to access the WIFI. If the Accreditation area had been set up in such a way that participants could go to a desk displaying their surname initials then this could have prevented this time delay.

### **7.1.10 Information desks for each sports at the accreditation venue.**

Many participants had questions regarding their sporting event, but there was no sports director available at the accreditation. This resulted in many of the questions and concerns not being able to be addressed to at this time. For future games it would be beneficial to athletes if they were able to ask any final questions or raise issues at the accreditation venue with the relevant person responsible for the sport.

### **7.1.11 Proper signage for all venues throughout the week.**

Many participants found it difficult to locate some of the venues. This was due to a lack of signage that never made it to the proper locations, was removed by people passing or by the windy weather. Going forward, all venues should have addresses and maps easily accessible to the participants, and that all signage should be checked throughout the tournament to make sure it is still visible.

### **7.1.12 LGBT Sports Managers**

To ensure that LGBT sporting events are run according to general LGBT expectations there should be emphasis on acquiring LGBT clubs to host the competitions. Mainstream sport events sometimes follow different rules and regulations and not all participants have attended comparable mainstream sport events previously. It is therefore necessary to manage the participants' expectations from an early stage. If a local LGBT host cannot be found then the organising committee should ensure that managers from local clubs are asked to host. No competition should be without a host club to maintain a minimum level of standard for the competition.

### 7.1.13 Experience

In the case that the organizing club did not prove its capability to organise multipart tournaments in the past, an extra budget should be available that can be allocated to sport specialists who would then have to travel to the host city to support the organising organisation. The organising organisation should submit a list of all tournaments organised by the organisation before being allowed to submit a bid for EuroGames.

### 7.1.14 If there is a shortage of medals during the games give the option to print a certificate for the participant.

Due to logistical challenges some of the medals were not available at the event for the winners. To acknowledge the winners in a proper manner it should be possible for the participant to print off a certificate with their winning time/distance clearly displayed. This would be a satisfactory temporary solution until the medal was given to the person at a later stage or posted out to their home address

### 7.1.15 Set Tasks and Responsibilities

If Eurogames incorporates championships of external single sport federations a clear task and responsibility sharing and definition has to be ensured

To ensure that the organising organisation has the required expertise and skills to organise a sport, the list of sport managers with their respective experience has to be included in the bid.

### 7.1.16 A short survey from the EGLSF to all participants after the EuroGames.

In order to get feedback from all participants we, the board of the EGLSF, will send out a short survey to each participant. The feedback from this survey will be used to improve further EuroGames.

## 8 Legacy & Lasting Impact

The board of the EGLSF have begun to create a handbook for each sport, commencing with the sports being offered in Helsinki, June 2016. The directory of sports specialists has been already created and is freely available online (<http://www.eglsf.info/eurogames/>). There are two official liaison board members appointed and as of January 2016 have been in direct contact via skype with the Helsinki organising committee to discuss their current activities.

It is important to note the legacy and lasting impact the EuroGames had on the city of Stockholm and the country of Sweden. The Stockholms Snipers have grown, both in members and divisions. Track and field and volleyball divisions has been set-up prior or just after the games, as a direct result from the EuroGames.

There has also been an increase in LBGTIQ awareness within the city of Stockholm, as every volunteer was given LBGTIQ specific education at each of the venues. The city of Stockholm along with the Swedish media have committed to continue the awareness of LBGTIQ issues for the future.

The hockey team Kiruna Hockey has started to play in team jerseys that are rainbow coloured.

The team captain for the Swedish handball team has begun to play with, and hand out, his captain banner in rainbow colours. This is a due to the fact that he saw the Stockholm Snipers handball team carry out this gesture on the news. This was made possible with the cooperation of the Swedish National Handball Association.

## 9 Appendix

### 9.1 Statement from the President of the organising committee



#### **Dear Participants, Visitors & Spectators,**

From myself, the board and the whole team behind EuroGames Stockholm 2015 we would like to hugely and truly apologize for cancelling the triathlon, the venue/schedule change for volleyball, unclear communication for track & field and the schedule changes for swimming.

We will try our very best to change and improve all situations and fight day and night to make the best out of all single situations. Of course, none of this has happened on purpose. With years of planning, assistance from experts and national sport federations this should not have happen and we recognize and respect all feedback and complaints. We take full responsibility and will try to solve every single situation so that you can compete and engage in EuroGames Stockholm 2015.

Our intention and goal has been to organize the best EuroGames ever and we have listened to your thought and criticism, but also your positive feedback, to create an amazing game. We are deeply sorry for the lack of communication, information on short notice and the problems we've might put you under. This hasn't been our intention.

We do hope that you still have had and will have a great EuroGames experience, And once again – we are truly sorry for this.



Sincerely,  
Jakob Jansson

President - EuroGames Stockholm 2015 ©

<http://www.eurogamesstockholm.com>  
<http://www.twitter.com/eurogamessthlm>  
<http://www.facebook.com/eurogamesstockholm>

## 9.2 Statement from the EGLSF Board

Dear EGLSF Members,

For those of you who are participating at the 2015 EuroGames in Stockholm, and especially if you have been affected by the lack of organisation and communication, we owe you a sincere apology.

As licensor of the EuroGames we take the responsibility of the success of the games very seriously, and we are determined to find out why these situations occurred.

We will be investigating each of the events that caused the problems in depth, and we also invite you to email your comments and experiences to [egs@eglsf.info](mailto:egs@eglsf.info)

We will take this information and work to make the future of the EuroGames a better experience.

The EGLSF Board

## 9.3 The EuroGames Committee

**Motion No°18:** Creating a "Future of EuroGames" Committee (accepted by the AGA)

Submitted by Düsseldorf Dolphins and John Blanckenstein Foundation

This committee's mission is to develop a roadmap on the EuroGames' strategy, which describes the path to the main goal of establishing and sustaining EuroGames as the major European LGBTIQ-sports-championship, that contributes to visibility, involvement and equality for LGBTIQ people throughout Europe. It takes the following perspectives into account:

- the financial perspective - for example: gain sustainable funds to run EuroGames and support EuroGames to be held in "disfortuned" countries.
- the stakeholder perspective - for example the participants - even those beyond the range of a sports-clubs-structure in terms of social structures, age-structures and youth, the organizing committee, the organizing city and the EGLSF.
- the internal perspective - for example a high standard of organization, a professional service concept, intensive collaboration with partners and a EuroGames-compliance. Furthermore, the committee will develop detailed approaches to fit the needs of the mentioned perspectives and will prove the feasibility of those approaches by "proof of concept" samples, for instance in collaboration with the EuroGames Stockholm. The committee will present it's results, proved concepts and suggestions to the AGA, the EGLSF board and future EuroGames-hosts.

Lou Manders (IJsselstein), Hans van Dop (Rotterdam), Philip Houtermans (Antwerp), Markus Zittlau (Düsseldorf) and Jakob Jansson (Stockholm) expressed their participation.