

**3rd Annual meeting of the Rainbow Cities Network
19 November 2015**

Official Opening by City Councilor Mrs S. Salerno for Gender Equality and Diversity

Minutes – Internal Part I

Subject: Report – Internal Part I

Date: 19 November 2015

Time: 14:30 – 16:00

Place: Palais Eynard, Geneva

Procedure: Round Table discussion and activity “Questions and Actions cards discussion”.

Distribution: RAINBOW-CITIES Mailing List 2015

Participants: Juul van Hoof, MOVISIE (coordinator); Guillaume Mandicourt / Laura Parisotto, Geneva (Switzerland); Arnold van den Broek, Amsterdam (The Netherlands); Florencio Chicote, Berlin (Germany); David Humphreys, Brighton and Hove (UK); Christian Rahmfeldt, Cologne (Germany); Sabien Blondeel, Ghent (Belgium); Thomas Adank, Hannover (Germany); Simona Topolinjak, Ljubljana (Slovenia); Grace Proch / Sören Landmann, Mannheim (Germany); Corry Wolfs, Rotterdam (The Netherlands); Eufemio Gianluca Truppa, Turin (Italy); Angela Schwarz / Wolfgang Wilhelm, Vienna (Austria); Aner Voloder, Zurich (Switzerland).

Absent (excused): Adriana Aguilera Mexico City (Mexico), Fatima Aliyat, Utrecht (The Netherlands), Katharina Buhk, Hamburg (Germany), Manuel Rodenas, Madrid (Spain), Melinda Dolan, Dumfries & Galloway (Schotland), Solve Saetre, Bergen (Norway), Ulrike Mößbauer - Munich (Germany).

1) Topics of discussion:

- Updates by Cities
- Sharing experiences and platform for partnership
- Refugees LGBT (proposal 1)

2) Introduction: Mr. Mandicourt opened the session (practical information for today and tomorrow concerning the joint session with the DFAE).

Juul van Hoof made some announcements (on new cities, Brighton, Mannheim and Mexico City). Bergen, Dumfries and Galloway, Hamburg, Madrid, Munich and Utrecht could not attend (excused). Cities are expressing to enter: many Italian cities. Barcelona, Paris, Istanbul (two city districts). Maybe some Norwegian cities. Juul is also in touch with Buenos Aires and Rosario, Argentina and Montevideo in Uruguay, but she underlined that the focus will be in Europe because it remains a European-region Network. She informed about some progress concerning the Memorandum of Understanding: we will keep in touch by emails. - Asking of some others announcements despite the one pagers?

- Some comments: Mrs. Topolinjak to the floor concerning the Slovenian situation. A referendum on a bill defining marriage as a union between two persons will be held in Slovenia on 20th December 2015 (background situation: In March the Parliament adopted an amending act on marriage and family relations. The Constitutional Court has allowed a referendum). The City of Ljubljana is expressing its concerns and is actively campaigning to legalise same-sex marriage by the population.
- Some reactions: Mr. Chicote asked if the Church is involved in the campaign in Slovenia. Mr. Mandicourt made a parallel observation concerning Christian Democrats' initiative to introduce in the Swiss Constitution - for the first time ever - the definition of marriage as « union between a man and a woman », and about the possibility that the Swiss people will vote on the Christian

Democrats' proposal in a referendum on 28 February 2016. If voted yes, "same sex marriage" would become constitutionally problematic. (Background situation: Switzerland has allowed registered partnerships for same-sex couples since 1 January 2007). Mr. Voloder adds that apparently the Swiss Government announced yesterday that it want to reject it.

3) Findings and sharing of experiences

LGBT Refugees¹ theme

Juul: move on the topic LGBT Refugee, decided among others due to the urgency of the subject. She underlined the importance of the topic also because of the not being accepted of these people by other refugees in center or critical situation in the countries of transit. LGBTI people are forced to lead lives of silence in many places in the world (punished in many countries by torture and death). Problem: today, an increasing number of LGBTI-identified people are unwilling or unable to exist in this state of origin and try to escape their persecution by seeking asylum in EU.

Discussion: Mr. Chicote (some comments to the round table) spoke on the Berlin situation (refugees received and on the estimated LGBT people growing number). Point out that "Outing" is quite sensitive topic, especially if linked to housing conditions). He stressed their collaboration and dialogue with NGOS. **Example:** the "Lesbian Organization" made a survey in the refugee center asking for head crime experiences and violence within the refugees center. Most of them say there were no problems but social workers in the center gave a different response. Result: this became a focus to follow. The situation now is quite serious for refugees in Berlin to find a house or an accommodation and in parallel there is the need to look for a safe LGBT environment for LGBT refugees (i.e. Directive; municipality responsible of housing and care concerning special vulnerability of some groups to define they need a specific treatment). **Result:** This is a new area so it is important to share experiences, doubts and trying to share practical information as well. It is important to discuss among us about that today. **Discussion:** Mrs. Schwarz asked for details concerning their cooperation (in Berlin) – cooperation project with NGOS and the administration: who is responsible for refugees (department?).

Activity: Questions and Actions CARDS (Juul and Guillaume, moderating).

Juul: invited the group to work on the topic by means of "Questions and ACTIONS CARDS" activity writing a question on the cards or to write down a topic to be discussed with the table (also good examples to share and cluster then together to have a better overview). / Juul: questions. Guillaume: clustering good practices.

Clustered Questions:

(Racism and safety)

- How to deal with increasing racism in the queer community? (Working against sorrow of LGBTI people that they freedom is in danger).
- How do you create safety in reception centers? For LGBTI people and Trans*. / Create LGBTI specific centers?
- How did you manage relationships, if any, between LGBT refugees and their ethnic community living in your cities?
- How to manage their fear concerning gender-related issues and orientation?

(Reaching them, information and help without "outing" them")

¹ In this discussion the term "refugee" is sometime used instead of the "asylum-seeker" one. Despite this fact, we are aware that the term asylum-seeker designs someone whose claim has not yet been definitively evaluated. National asylum systems are there to decide which asylum-seekers actually qualify for international protection.

- How do you approach LGBT refugees? Do they want you at are they sent to you by NGOs/Asylum centers?
- How to help them without “outing” them? – In the process of reaching them, informing them about their possibilities and opportunities, and despite the fact they might have separate housing.
- Poster campaigns, flyers and information?
- Coming out, where? When? How to deal with the two different ideas: being open in the application process and to hide it in the reception centers?
- How to reach refugees before they apply for a “status”?
- What about the others refugees? Do we have to inform them about LGBTI people and matters?
- How to get LGBT groups attention?

(Cooperation, responsibilities and funds)

- Cooperation with NGOs? Contact and cooperation with specific department or authorities in charge of “refugees”?
- Is it better to deal with LGBTI refugees as a separate topic or in the context of other vulnerable group like pregnant women?
- Who is in charge? COA, National Gov. or cities?
- What are quick wins for local governments – small cities with limited resources - to initiate actions?
- How did you fund specific housing for LGBT refugees?

(Training and education)

- Is there training for people working in the houses where refugees are living?
- Are there any training modules known? Training for professional? Problem of time management: lack of time for education, how to create focus on this?
- Are centers’ employee’s sensitives?
- How to raise awareness about LGBTI topics?
- What about the others refugees? Do we have to inform them about LGBTI people and matters?
- Is there a specific training of asylum center staff?

Clustered good practices / some results:

Action I: definition of vulnerable groups. Clarify the terms to better provide “good practices”.

- Definition of LGBTI as “vulnerable group” (as being official). In Vienna, LGBTI refugees are a vulnerable group (Mrs. Schwarz’s comment).
- To create an alliance with the women department (as another vulnerable group), this is not only a question but an action to accomplish.
- Sharing studies and actions undertaken on LGBTI refugees.
- Provide a certificate for safe shelters/reception centers for LGBT refugees.
- Having the “confirmation” of LGBTI refugees as a vulnerable group.

Action II: Training and modules and providing interpretation services in the centers. Provide clear and accessible information and expertise for both social workers and the Refugees community (included the LGBTI one).

- Trainings. Top down reception centers / Registration centers with interpretations and integration system. Providing expertise on transgender refugees (i.e. attention to medical care). Provide Doctors or medical staff in refugee shelters.
- All LGBT refugees are taken into consideration for basic care by Vienna municipality.
- Meeting Center for peer to peer contact with the local LGBT community (example of Rotterdam)
- Inform and communicate with the appropriate and responsible administration (see our own country and specific system). To do something for informing and better prepare social workers.

- Provides and think how to prepare LGBT trainings to people living in the flat where LGBT refugees are hosted. Thinking about actions and training on “inclusion”, against racism and homophobia, mutual respect, dialogues and practice for tolerance and, possibly, acceptance (proposed by the City of Turin).
- Create specialized counselling centers.

Action III: Provide better distribution of info materials and targeted materials. Implement the use of new technologies, social media and Apps, etc.

- Integrate written information on LGBTI support possibilities not separately but integrated in other support materials for refugees with a special focus on that matter, following the principle that “if something is more under the radar, there are less risks”.
- Increase, better distribute and spread flyers and/or specific targeted information/materials made by NGOs working on these issues.
- Implement the use and the importance of social networks, Apps and using the new technologies to facilitate the communication and to raise awareness among LGBT refugees (before and even after their “status”).
- Taking into consideration the “mouth to mouth” approach to pass crucial information (underlined by the Vienna representative).

Action IV: Legal Aid and collaboration with other authorities and/or administrations and/or Institutions.

- Legal Aid for LGBT people “refugees” or asylum-seekers in all domains, including the legal aspect helping them obtaining (maybe?) the status as refugee, BUT only if these people are residing in the Zurich canton.
- Working together with NGOs and other city-administrations or departments.
- Alliance with the women department (as another vulnerable group), this is not only a question but an action to accomplish.
- Inform and cooperate with the appropriate and responsible administration (see our own country and specific system).
- Create specialized counselling centers.
- Collaboration with other department or services (i.e. Health; Migration and Integration, Equal opportunities, Sport, etc.).

Action IV: Housing, flat and accommodation.

- Using NGOs as reception centers, if possible (suggested by the Mannheim representative).
- Create sensitive refugees camps (will be proved) all in 2-3 years. (Hannover)
- To solve the housing problem; self-organized action.
- Hosting by families or people living in the municipality. The Church too (i.e. Vienna)
- Special anonymous ‘safe houses’ for LGBTI refugees who have become victim of bullying and intimidation in the centers (City of Amsterdam)

Discussion questions and good practices:

It has been shown during the discussion that main areas of interest are the ones clustered here above (questions and actions).

Other interesting points mentioned in the conversation are the following: which strategy to adopt? Is it better to make a document or not? Is it worthy/good to have a formal report to share also in a larger way? Make a policy and defend it like a statement. Juul pointed out that the RCN is a network and representatives do not have here the power of representing their cities in a political way. Moreover, LGBT policies and LGBT-related fields are also quite sensitive matters as political issues). In this context RCN has the power to share and –maybe – advocate for good practices but not coming up with solutions, thus RCN and representatives cannot represent their cities and the different political wings.

Conclusions:

In this 3rd Annual meeting of the Rainbow Cities Network - Internal Part I - the following topics have been mostly discussed: how to deal with racism and safety problems; how to inform the LGBT groups without "outing" them or without worsening their current situations as refugees in centers or in some communities, living with other refugees that may not accept them as they are. During the session, the importance of clarifying the terms as "vulnerable group" and defining LGBT refugee as "vulnerable one" has been pointed out as well. Thus, it is crucial to clarify these terms to better come up with "good practices" for the future.

It has been shown that there is a need of implementing trainings and modules (both staff in touch with LGBT refugees and refugees themselves), providing interpretation services in centers. Providing clear and accessible information and expertise for both social workers and the Refugees community (included the LGBTI one) and implementing the use of new technologies, social media and Apps, etc. to facilitate the communication and to raise awareness among LGBT refugees (before and even after their "status"). Thinking about actions and raising-awareness actions on inclusion, "against racism, discrimination and homophobia" ones for tolerance and, possibly, acceptance. There is also the need to increase, better distribute and spread flyers and/or specific targeted information/materials made by NGOs working on these issues to LGBT refugees. Some others problems emerged during the session concerning the legal aid for LGBT refugees (taking into account specific national system as well), LGBT groups in very critical situation, as conditions in the prisons (i.e. ATP - Association for the prevention of torture - mentioned by Guillaume) and collaboration with other authorities and/or administrations and/or Institutions (also at the EU level). Another problem is providing safe housing, and accommodation.

This framework proposed an overview to facilitate the evaluation and monitoring of interventions in underserved areas (counselling, better target info, houses and LGBT specific accommodations, etc.). The session was also an exchange that suggests a comprehensive approach for the implementation, monitoring, evaluation of mutual cities interventions (briefly mentioned in the One pagers). Keep going on informing the Network concerning studies, surveys and pilot projects during the next year will be also essential for good results and the success of the RCN.

The outcome of this discussion can be used to refer to good practices and possible approaches by cities when dealing with LGBT refugees. Before this text can be shared publicly, all cities have to agree to the text above. Addition comments to this part are welcomed via email.

Perspective after 2016: Keep going on with these exchanges and communicating during the next year (Congress 2016). Encouraging of sharing and using the mailing list. Make everyone sign the MoU and be aware of the common grounds agreed during previous annual meetings/sessions.

End of the 1st session: 16:08pm.

3rd Annual meeting of the Rainbow Cities Network
19 November 2015

Minutes – Internal Part II

Subject: Report – Internal Part II

Date: 19 November 2015

Time: 16:30 – 19:10

Place: Palais Eynard, Geneva

Procedure: Round Table discussion; PTT for Logo.

Distribution: RAINBOW-CITIES Mailing List 2015

Topics of discussion:

- Voting procedure (proposal 2)
- Common action (proposal 3)
- RCN logo / how to use the logo (proposal 4)
- Introduction of the scenario after 2016 (proposal 5)
- Next meetings (2016 and 2017)

1) Proposal 2: Voting procedure

Juul started the introduction of the 2nd session of proposal 2 on the voting procedure.

Background situation in brief: In order to decide on topics relevant to the Network, the prep team suggests the following procedure:

- Keep it simple: no complicated or formal procedure, but a working method for taking decisions
- In general, decisions are made in the annual meeting
- Exception are made for voting by email for responses that need quick answers: membership applications, the logo procedure, responses to proposals e.g.
- The voting is by majority: 50% of the members present plus one
- For email votes, the majority of votes before the designated deadline (50% +1)
- Each active member city has one vote.

Voting procedure on proposal number 2

(Reminder: each city has just one vote even if they are represented by 2 city members).

Some comments/discussion before voting: The representative of Vienna asked about the email voting procedure? (Same majority principle of the mailing list members). The representative of Mannheim raised the question concerning a minimum-frame-time for email vote? Some Suggestions from the floor: 2 weeks? Or, if it is urgent: 1 week. This was confirmed by a majority vote. Representative from Berlin underlined the fact that important aspects must be voted during the meetings, some others “less important” that can be voted by email.

Representative from Mannheim (Sören) called the floor into the definition of “active member” (Discussion postponed). On abstained vote, if they are counting or not? On email voting (some precisions on using maybe a qualified majority, from the representative of Turin). Juul specified the need to “keep it simple”, to do not “call for vote” and concerning the problem of dealing with backup if a city-representative do not reply or participate for a long time.

It was decided that each city provides the coordinator with the contact details of a colleague who can be contacted in case of non-response. This person does not have to be added to the mailing list, but they can, if they want to.

Vote: Everybody. **Proposal 2 approved, unchanged.**

2) Proposal 3 Common action by the RCN

JOINT PICTURE EXHIBITION PROJECT 2016

Juul started with a background explanation: The Rainbow Cities agree to hold a joint photo exhibition in 2016 on a certain topic. The exhibition is composed to stress the common experiences in all member cities, sensitize for the topic and/or emphasize the joint actions and the visibility of the network. The topic would be discussed and determined beforehand (e.g. rainbow families, transgender citizens, LGBT(l)-refugees, etc.).

Every city is free to choose their own image/message within the chosen topic at their own costs and send it in within the given deadline to the person(s) coordinating the project. Make sure that the photos are available on 300 dpi for the purpose to print them and that you own the right to use it (copyright). The person(s) coordinating the project will be determined during the annual meeting of the network in Geneva provided the member cities agree to pursue the project. Every city can decide then, if they want to print them and exhibit them as a common RCN exhibition or if the city doesn't have the budget they show them on their website as an online exhibition. The photos should be branded with the logo of the network.

Cities participating in the project are expected to exhibit the photo exhibition publicly for example at IDAHOT day in their cities in accordance with their possibilities and in a way they consider as appropriate (e.g. in the City Hall, as a part of an exhibition in the city, public transport, outdoors, during seminars or conferences of the city, websites etc.). They can also draft a press release, but they are not obliged to.

Some discussion and/or comments before the vote: some concerns have been expressed regarding the use of the pics in accordance with established practices and customary formalities. A short discussion came out on appropriate precautions and "good use" of this photographic material. The representative of Turin expressed the interest of their City Councilor in the exhibition project. Mr. Truppa expressed as well the possibility to contact the EU Parliament. The members see no objection, but stress that it is up to each city to do this, but this will not be done in the name of the RCN. Some technical details have been also discussed among the members of the round table (as DPI, frame, online version or printed one, management of the exhibit, etc.). A short debate came out too on topics and messages to convey, on rules, content and marketing policies, etc.

VOTE: Proposal 3 accepted. / Rainbow Cities is the first theme of the expo. M. Wilhelm, Vienna representative is in charge of the procedure. He will send a brief instruction to the RCN members after which members can send in their photographs.

3) RCN logo / how to use the logo (proposal 4)

Mr. Chicote, city of Berlin, in charge of the Logo design, showed to the round table some approaches to the concept, and development of the Logo based on feedbacks and previous exchanges.

3 approaches:

- Being connected?
- Living equality?
- Keep it simple?

VOTE : Approach 1 Being connected proposition, dots b, has been approved with 7 votes (choice of font and style). Right image **has been approved.**

Proposal 3: Internal guidelines on how to use the logo

Juul gave some background information on the RCN Logo: it is used by active members of the RCN always in a responsible way. It can be used on their specific websites or products with a direct link to the RCN. Co-branding (RCN logo in combination with other logos such as logo of the city, the department etc.) shall be used for products (e.g. publications) and activities in which the RCN is involved.

Some decision: it is not possible to “play” with the Logo design. No change. Fixed number of dots. The Logo is fixed. Concerning rules, a standard protocol has been used (i.e. EU logo). No color change is possible.

VOTE: approach 1 dots b (only difference, 2 alinea): **Majority. Approved.**

4) Scenarios for the RCN after 2016 (proposal 5)

The current situation, with a coordinator of the network, is guaranteed until the end of 2016. The City of Amsterdam hires Juul van Hoof/ Movisie as the coordinator, with financial support of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Sciences.

- Explanation of tasks and the financial situation for the future coordination of the network.
- Explanation of the 4 scenarios proposed by the prep team (see proposal 5 for details).

(Juul leaves the room to give opportunity for discussion apart from her position).

Discussion on budget:

- current situation (€50.000)
or
- reduces services (€25.000)

Discussion: How to find money from others sources? What is affordable or not? The possibility of involving the EU Commission has been explored as well, some concerns have also been shown: how to deal with the official procedure? How to deal the impossibility of using public funds? Proposing concrete projects? Others concerns regarding EU law, registration as MOVISIE but not as the Network, put membership fees, legal ways and call for proposal have been discussed among the representatives.

It has also been pointed out that the RCN is a project itself and to present it directly to the EU Commission can be a way. Expecting to be founded came out once more. Discussion on how to fit into the “call for proposal” criteria (i.e. many cities, “discrimination” and LGBT interest, etc.). Discussion on EU guidelines to estimate the cost for one hour of work, checking up who can participate and working on an estimation of budget and a switching of framework to make it compatible).

5) Next meeting 2016

The representative of Amsterdam explained briefly the proposal for the next meeting (4-5 August 2016). The program is a part of EuroPride, coinciding with international meetings and the annual Amsterdam Canal Pride. Location is the City’s Archive in the historical center.

Arnold also mentions the intention of Amsterdam’s mayor to host a parallel meeting with his colleague Rainbow City Mayors. Their meeting would be a separate meeting, parallel to the RCN members, with a joint reception at the Mayor’s residence.

The members do wish to add that the meeting can only for this time be approved to take place in a different month than the agreed month of November.

VOTE: Amsterdam’s proposal is APPROVED.

End of the session: 19:10pm

3rd Annual meeting of the Rainbow Cities Network

20 November 2015

Minutes – Internal Part III

Subject: Report – Internal Part II

Date: 20 November 2015

Time: 9:00 – 11:00

Place: Palais Eynard, Geneva

Topic of Discussion:

- Continued discussion and decision on the scenario after 2016 (proposal 4)
 - Additions to RCN Common Grounds document (proposal 6)
 - Next meetings in 2016 and 2017
-

1) Scenarios for the RCN after 2016 (proposal 4)

Guillaume sums up yesterday's discussion. Discussion on perspectives and funding or co-funding possibilities. On guidelines and date for starting groups and preparatory meetings.

The RCN members prefer to keep things as they are: with a coordinator and a somewhat informal structure. They are aware of the need for funding now the Dutch government is not likely to financially support the network as it has done the last 3 years. Juul explains the contacts she had with the European Commission and the hint that the RCN should look into the Call for proposals due to be launched by DG Justice in December or January. The issue of co-financing should be looked into. Either some cities will contribute, or additional funding can be applied with the Dutch government or other national governments. A membership fee is not favored by the members, as this will mean that some cities will not be able to be a member anymore.

The decision is taken for a smaller group of RCN members to examine the funding possibilities. Arnold (Amsterdam), Wolfgang (Vienna) and Thomas (Hannover) volunteered to look into funding possibilities, together with Juul. They will keep the RCN members updated via the mailing list.

2) Additions to the Common Grounds document (proposal 6)

At the annual meeting in 2014 in Vienna, a set of common grounds were formulated. These common grounds remain valid, but some grounds needed updating or additions. Below you find the proposals for additions to the existing common grounds. The final (updated) version of the Common Grounds will be sent along with these minutes.

A. Procedure for interested cities and confirmation of membership:

1. The official application consists of:

- a. The signed Memorandum of Understanding
- b. A one pager on the specifics of the local LGBT policy

2. The applying city sends it to the Network via the coordinator, after which the member cities can give feedback.

a. In case of positive feedback, the coordinator will confirm membership and add the contact person(s) to the mailing list

b. In case of an objection, the decision on the membership of that particular city will be postponed to and discussed at the following annual meeting. An objection needs to be grounded and the applying city will be invited to clarify on any questions of the member cities. The decision will then be taken via the established voting procedure.

VOTE: Approved.

B. On procedure regarding 'inactive' cities

Discussion on how to deal with inactive members; some cities became a member some time ago, but have not been in touch and/or have not signed the MoU yet without giving a reason. Discussion on members who cannot attend the annual meeting: sending excuses for not being able to attend a meeting means being still active as a member. The discussion went on political obstacles to be defined as an active city and on other collateral matters (holidays, illness, deadlines and time of replying to the mailing list, etc.).

- The mention to add a specific status on sleeping cities has been added.
- One year time (to reply) has been fixed.
- One Pager is the way cities have to communicate (no policy). The MoU remains mandatory for all members to sign and commit to.

In the discussion, it has been discovered that Antwerp, Brussels, Dumfries & Galloway and Madrid did not sign the MoU yet.

Voting procedure: if members have been inactive according to the mentioned preconditions for over a year, they have to reapply for membership via the official procedure.

VOTE: Approved.

C. On representatives of member cities in the Network

VOTE: Approved, unaltered.

3) Next meetings in 2016 and 2017 – Continued discussion and decision

Yesterday, Amsterdam was voted as the host for the 2016 RCN annual meeting.

As democratic process, the procedure to nominate a city for the RCN 2017 has been introduced by Guillaume.

Two cities offered to host: Madrid and Ljubljana. Manuel Rodenas sent an email on 17 November 2015 via the mailing list, offering to host the annual meeting during the World Pride in Madrid in the last week of June 2017. Simona propose to candidate Ljubljana in the meeting (after previous discussion with city councilors).

The members discussed the fact that coinciding with a major event, as in 2016 with EuroPride Amsterdam is preferably only once. They expressed their preference to stick to the decision that was taken in the 2014 meeting in Vienna: to hold the annual meetings in November.

VOTE: Location of the annual meeting in 2017: All votes go to Ljubljana.

Prep meeting 2016:

The preparatory meetings are held in a different city each year, approximately 2 months prior to the annual meeting. The meeting takes 1,5 day and the prep team is formed by the coordinator and 3 other member cities. It is decided that the prep team will consist of 4 people: representatives of the hosting city of the previous annual meeting, the hosting city of the annual meeting to come, the hosting city of the prep meeting and the coordinator.

Vienna applies for hosting. Ghent too, but they have to check with city councilor and manager a final approval.

Juul explains that the prep meeting preferably takes place in another city each year, to give a chance to cities who are not able to organize the bigger annual meetings to do show their commitment. **For this reason, Ghent is voted the location for the prep meeting in 2016.**

End 10:40

TIME LEFT for Discussion: (expected end at 11:00). Thus, Juul proposed to discuss and brainstorm a little bit more on Refugees.

Some results:

- 1) Cooperation with NGOs came up. (How rely on them? Responsibility to share?)
- 2) Posting campaign, practical information to provide (how and where)? Flyers? Informing them, how? The members agree to commit to distributing materials and information via the mailing list.
- 3) How to reach out the LGBT refugees before their formal application process?
- 4) EU commission, we can address to them to have a better knowledge?

For the rest of the day: proposition to try to reach and informed the National FP present during the "Autonomous but connected" afternoon-session on this urgent topic (LGBT refuges) emerged these days (19th and 20th Nov.) Informing National FP that RCN is dealing with that topic and Cities will be enthusiastic to work on that with the National collaboration.

End of the session: 11:00am

3rd Annual meeting of the Rainbow Cities Network

20 November 2015

Internal/External Part IV

Subject: Internal/External Part IV

Date: 20 November 2015

Time: 11:30 - 12:30

Place: Palais Eynard, Geneva

Procedure: Tour de table and PTT presentation + questions.

Organisations and associations attending: Mrs Chatty Ecoffey for Association 360; M. Jean-Sébastien Blanc for Association pour la prévention de la torture (APT); Christophe Catin for Dialogai; Mrs Agnes Boulmer for Everybody's Perfect; Delphine Roux for the Fédération genevoise des associations LGBT; Juan Fernando Caicedo R. for H2O; M. Renato Sabbadini for ILGA, Mrs. Sandrine Cina for Invisible Experience; Mrs Eleonore Varone for Les Indociles; Christine Barthélémy for LWork; Daniel Seiler for Network; Max Krieg for Pink Cross; Martin Della Valle for Swiss Rainbow Families Association – NELFA; Alexandre Brunner for Thomson Reuters - Pride at work ; Xavier Orellana for UN GLOBE; Daniela Truffer for Zwischengeschlecht .

Absent (excused): Leila Lohman for Haut-Commissariat pour les Réfugiés (UNHCR).

Topic of discussion :

- Meeting with the local and international civil society organizations.

1. Introduction of the discussion and Presentations

360: introductive talking points to present the 360 Association / Social and legal platform (asylum, reg. partnerships). On the Brochures designated for professional of education/ Nov. 20 (manifestation). TDor. Parties and events (general public) – benefits for the associations. Magazine.

APT: Suisse based organization. But It works worldwide mainly on LGBT people deprived of their liberty. / We prevent other ill-treatments / Advocacy with International bodies. / Develop guidance's and practical tools. Database for specialist (it can be combined).

Dialogai: descriptions of activities. Non-profit organization (context of AIDS). Working and develop a program with University of Zurich on health of gay people (having data). – Presentation (2008). Organization works on the possibility to get in touch with professional and therapists. / The "Refuge", help for young LGBT. Prevention and fight against suicide and suicide-related issues. Dialogai proposes training with Police to sensitize the staff on violence and homophobia and consequences on health.

Everybody's perfect: Festival (every 2 years) the only one in French part of Switzerland – Aim to have a focus on Intersexual people – The Festival has an analytic approach, interdisciplinary and transversal. Festival is accompanied by debates and conferences. They work also with Hospitals and Institutions.

Fédération genevoise des associations LGBT: Description ; 5 associations together. They work to better prevent homophobia and transphobia, FEDE was born in 2008 mainly for that reason/need. Some works and collaboration

presented: TOTEM / Campaign May 2015. They are proposing workshops, training and seminars for students and teachers. "Diversity in the workplace"; 2 conferences : get together with companies to highlight the difficulties of LGBT people. / Collaboration with UNI (gender department) to analyse stereotypes, injuries, verbal violence etc.

H2O: Swimming club. It is an International network for swimming competitions.

ILGA: Oldest and largest GBT org. in Europe (now also worldwide). First born in UK and then established formally in Belgium / ECOSOC status at the UN. 1) Human rights Council – rotates around advocacy. Support member or non-member org. to submit reports and lobby directly. 2) Regional development programs (Buenos Aires – South Africa and Asia). – get in touch with relevant authorities. / Advocate / Doing research and LGBT related-issues from both social and juridical perspective. Developing instrument as Map on LGBT rights in the world. Collecting data and analysis.

Invisible Experience: Suisse org. / help org. to develop a more inclusive environment for LGBT people. / We provide training and event for young people to be active / Also employers' programs (to manage the diversity and to evaluate their level of inclusion). – Pilot phase, looking for Public institutions and companies to use our platform and to test it.

Les Indociles: Main idea: fight against discriminations through art (Manifesto). They are using cultural power for that aim. Some recent projects developed in Vallis Canton: workshops in schools. Keep in touch with 22 municipalities (only 5 accepted) to propose expositions and events (film, debate, soirées lectures, etc).

LWork: professional Network / Main idea: to create and develop a secure platform to discuss and communicate among lesbians women in Switzerland.

Network: 20 year ago in Zurich – core aim is still foster / 1) cultural and art: cultural price for artist (lgbt people or linked to lgbt issues). 2) lgbt in the work place, charte of diversity. Launch LGBT friendly label for companies. 3) Internationally: city of Milan, seminars "leaders for change". Important for attract LGBT talents. 4) Political level: we have many politicians.

Pink Cross: Suisse gay federation (based in Bern). See PTT / Collaboration with ILGA.

NEFLA: see PPT

Pride at work: Explanation of the employees' Network. See PTT.

UN GLOBE: see PTT

Zwischengeschlecht: D. Truffer talked about her private experience (Intersex born). Personal path to explain some actions and some issues (how to get into the fight?). Thing still to do. Medical point of view.

(1 min silence for TDOR)

End of the session: 12:40pm