

**A STAKEHOLDER APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF THE
OLYMPIC GAMES IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

by

PARAMJOT SINGH CHAUHAN

**A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(HUMAN KINETICS)

**THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(VANCOUVER)**

FEBRUARY, 2008

© PARAMJOT SINGH CHAUHAN

ABSTRACT

Critics of the Olympic Games argue that rather than promoting the cherished values of Olympism, the Games have primarily been used as a means to leverage public funds to satisfy the economic interests of the elite, while typically returning to the community overdebtiness of hosting the event, unusable post event facilities and negative impacts to accommodations and its resident's standard of living (Andranovich, Burbank & Heying, 2001; Haxton, 1999; Hall, 2006; Hiller, 1990, Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Lenskyj 2003; Macintosh and Whitson, 1993).

For Vancouver, host city of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, to overcome such criticisms the organizing committee must work with its stakeholders, those with a stake rather than stock in the Games, to ensure that social development benefits are maximized and negative impacts are mitigated. The city's downtown eastside (DTES) has been singled out as the first area of focus by both the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (VANOC) and the Vancouver Agreement (VA), a public collaboration aimed at addressing the social issues that plague the area including business decline, unemployment, poverty, crime, and drug use (FERENCE & Weicker, 2002; Pivot, 2006; Vancouver Agreement, 2006). The 2010 Winter Games Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement (ICICS), adopted by VANOC and the VA, outlines the goal for an inclusive and socio-economic responsible Games. Understanding how each organization aims to use these Olympic Games to address the social development issues in the DTES was the primary focus of this study. Using stakeholder theory, the specific research questions included: 1) How do the focal organization (VA) and the stakeholders (VANOC) define the social development issue(s) underpinning their involvement in the ICICS? 2) How does VANOC see its role/interests in the VA and how does this compare with the VA's view of VANOC's role? 3) What factors are facilitating or constraining the sustainability of the relationship between the VA and VANOC? 4) What outcomes do the VA and VANOC hope to accomplish and how will these be assessed?

This case study from September 2005 to February 2006, used multiple qualitative research methods including document analysis of organizational reports, policies and media releases and purposive sampling to conduct 8-12 'elite' face to face interviews with administrators from VANOC, the 2010 Legacies Now Society, a non-profit society that works with community partners to develop social and economic opportunities surrounding the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, and those involved at the VA.

The study revealed the primary goal between these three organizations is to use determine how to effectively use these Olympic Games as a catalyst to address the social issues affecting the DTES. While acknowledging that these social issues will by no means be fully addressed by the time the Games are hosted, they continue to focus on building their relationships and within the community in order to accelerate this social agenda. Factors found to facilitating their own relationship and with the community include: inter organizational dynamics, the Olympic Games sectoral tables, and VANOC's Board of Directors. While administrators also identified factors constraining the relationship to include: managing working relationships with the community, government politics, and inter organizational challenges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Figures	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 The Olympic Games	1
1.2 Vancouver Downtown Eastside.....	5
1.3 The Vancouver Agreement.....	6
1.4 Purpose and Research Questions	8
Chapter Two: Review of Literature.....	9
2.1 The Olympics and Social Development	9
2.2 Theoretical Perspective.....	13
2.2.1 Corporate Social Responsibility	14
2.2.2 Stakeholder Management	16
2.2.3 Stakeholder Theory.....	18
2.2.3.1 The Focal Organization	20
2.2.3.2 The Stake	20
2.2.3.2.1 Stakeholder Analysis Model.....	21
2.2.3.3 Stakeholders.....	22
2.2.3.4 Stakeholder Salience.....	25
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	27
3.1 Methodology.....	27
3.1.1 Document Analysis.....	27
3.1.2 Semi - structured Elite Interviews	30
3.2 Data Analysis.....	32
3.3 Judging the Quality of the Data.....	35
3.4 Role of the Researcher.....	36
3.5 Limitations.....	37
Chapter Four: Results	40
4.1 Social Development.....	40
4.1.1 Vancouver Agreement.....	40
4.1.2 VANOC 43	
4.1.3 2010 Legacies Now Society	43
4.1.4 Key Social Issues Affecting Downtown Eastside	44
4.1.4.1 EXPO ‘86.....	45
4.1.4.2 Accessibility and Civil Liberties	46
4.1.4.3 Economic Revitalization.....	47
4.1.4.4 Housing and Homelessness	50
4.1.4.5 Health.....	53

4.2 Roles and Interest	55
4.2.1 Vancouver Agreement’s Role.....	56
4.2.2 VANOC’s Role.....	57
4.2.3 2010 Legacies Now Society’s Role.....	58
4.2.4 Strategies.....	60
4.2.4.1 Non ICI Commitment Related Inter Organizational Strategies.....	60
4.2.4.2 ICI Commitments Related to Inter Organizational Goals	61
4.3 Factors Facilitating Relationship Sustainability	64
4.3.1.1 Inter-Organizational Dynamics	64
4.3.1.2 Sectoral tables.....	68
4.3.1.3 VANOC Board of Directors	69
4.3.2 Factors Constraining Relationship Sustainability.....	71
4.3.2.1 Managing a Working Community Relationship.....	71
4.3.2.2 Governmental Politics	73
4.3.2.3 Inter Organizational Challenges	75
4.4 Outcomes	78
4.4.1 Vancouver Agreement Outcomes.....	79
4.4.2 VANOC Outcomes.....	79
4.4.3 2010 Legacies Now Society Outcomes	80
4.4.4 Evaluation.....	81
4.4.5 Timeframe.....	82
 Chapter Five: Discussion and Recommendations	 85
5.1 Discussion	85
5.2 Research Implications.....	90
5.2.1 Corporate Social Responsibility and Stakeholder Management	90
5.3 Future Research	94
 References	 96
 Appendix	 103
Appendix A1 - Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement	104
Appendix A2 - Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement - Update	108
Appendix B1 – Agency Information Sheet	110
Appendix B2 - Agency Consent Form (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement).....	112
Appendix C1 – Initial Letter of Consent (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement).....	113
Appendix C2 – Information Sheet (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement).....	114

Appendix C3 – Participant Consent Form (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement).....	116
Appendix D1 – Sample Face to Face Interview Questions for the Vancouver Agreement	117
Appendix D2 – Sample Face to Face Interview Questions for Vancouver Organizing Committee/2010 Legacies Now Society	119
Appendix E - Table of Codes	121
Appendix F - Table of Administrator’s Responses	129

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 Document Analysis - Vancouver Agreement.....	29
Figure 3.2 Document Analysis - VANOC.....	29
Figure 3.3 Document Analysis - 2010 Legacies Now Society	30
Figure 3.4 Sample Selection	31
Figure 3.5 Example of Coding Scheme	34

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To all those that have helped.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Olympic Games

As mega-events continue to grow in both size and spectator interest, the inevitable debate about the benefits and negative impacts of mega-events like the Olympic Games will continue as well. Proponents such as Preuss (1998) argue that the Olympic Games can provide benefits in the form of improved transportation infrastructures, more technologically advanced telecommunications systems, new sports facilities, and additional housing. Similarly, Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) identify the economic benefits to include positive impacts on employment, additional spending, increased tourism, increased media coverage, and usually some unspecified improvement in social conditions of the host community. All of this is packaged in the name of urban renewal by Olympic organizers to act as the catalyst for economic and social redevelopment (Burton, 2003; Hall, 2006; Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Humphrey & Plummer, 2000; La Salle, 2001; Manheim, 1990; Preuss, 1998; Whitson and Horne, 2006).

Critics, on the other hand, question the socio-economic and environmental costs of failed promises for responsible economic, social, environmental and community redevelopment by Olympic organizing committees. They cite negative impacts like overdebt to the host city (Burton, 2003; Haxton, 1999; Owen, 2002; Whitson & Horne, 2006), unusable post event facilities (Lenskyj, 2000; Searle, 2000; Owen, 2002), an elitist spectacle catering to only those who can afford it (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Macintosh and Whitson, 1993; Owen, 2002), and most notably, a rise in local housing and rental prices, and the social displacement of local residents (Burton, 2003; Hall & Hodges, 1997; Haxton 1999; Olds, 1996; Pivot, 2006; Preuss, 1998). Such critics argue

that promises of community regeneration have instead resulted in environmental destruction and the regentrification of existing communities under the guise of sound Olympic redevelopment. Furthermore, critics argue that rather than promoting the values of Olympism, the Olympic movement has become an economic motivator for the elite to use public funds for private interests without returning sufficient public benefit (Andranovich, Burbank & Heying, 2001; Haxton, 1999; Hall, 2006; Hiller, 1990, Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Lenskyj 2003; Macintosh & Whitson, 1993).

The 1996 Atlanta Summer Olympic Games is often used to illustrate the growing concerns associated with hosting the Olympic Games. As Helen Lenskyj (2000) describes in her book, *Inside the Olympic Industry*, the Atlanta Committee of the Olympic Games (ACOG) initially met with community activists and promised to protect against the loss of existing shelters and accommodations, cutbacks to emergency services to inner city neighbourhoods, and the erosion of human and civil rights (2000, p. 133). However, her (2000) post-Atlanta Olympic Games study showed evidence of ACOG's disregard in fulfilling its social promises. For example, she describes how spikes were planted around bushes where homeless people were known to sleep, communal restrooms were closed to the public including the homeless, and the city conducted "street sweeps" resulting in homeless people being arrested (Lenskyj, 2000). The "trash bill", instituted to arrest anyone found removing garbage from containers, was described as a deliberate attempt to remove the homeless from the streets (Lenskyj, 2000, p. 138). As well, Lenskyj comments on how the ACOG went as far as to fund \$500,000 - \$750,000 towards "Project Homeward Bound", a program with the purpose of transporting the city's

homeless out of Atlanta. Such examples only fuel the controversies over hosting mega-events like the Olympic Games.

This study aimed to examine how Vancouver, Canada, the host of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, plans to avoid the pitfalls of past Olympic host cities by becoming a stakeholder in a social development initiative known as the Vancouver Agreement (VA). For the purposes of this study, and to differentiate between the organization and the multi-lateral agreement to be detailed later, the organization will be referred to as the “Vancouver Agreement” (VA) and the multi lateral agreement between the three levels of government as the “Vancouver Agreement Multi Lateral Agreement” (VAMLA). The city’s downtown eastside (DTES) has been singled out by the VA, an urban development initiative between the governments of Canada, because of the growing social issues that plague the DTES including business decline, high rates of unemployment, poverty, crime, and drug use (FERENCE & WEICKER, 2002; PIVOT, 2006; VANCOUVER AGREEMENT, 2006).

The 2010 Winter Games Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement (ICICS) was created by the then Vancouver Bid Corporation, that was responsible for Vancouver’s bid and was later adopted by the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games (VANOC) and by its not-for-profit social development arm, 2010 Legacies Now Society (LGNOW). The 2010 Legacies Now Society is responsible for working with partners in all sectors towards developing legacies related legacies before and after the Olympic Games. This adoption of the ICICS by VANOC and LGNOW cements its intention towards an inclusive and socio-economic responsible Olympic Games as revealed in the following statement:

The Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement outlines the goals and objectives in the planning for and hosting of an inclusive Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games. The intent is to maximize the opportunities and mitigate potential impacts in Vancouver's Inner – City neighbourhoods from hosting the 2010 Winter Games (2010 Winter Games Inner – City Inclusive Commitment Statement, 2005, pg. 1).

This commitment towards an inclusive Olympic Games, represents a partnership between VANOC, LGNOW and the VA as each recognizes the other in reaching their respective mandates. For example, through the ICICS, VANOC has committed to:

programs and policies [which] will be developed that support the goals and objectives in the Commitment Statement to create a strong foundation for sustainable socio – economic development in Vancouver's inner – city neighborhoods, particularly in Downtown Eastside, Downtown South and Mount Pleasant...and the incorporation of the interests of different groups, such as aboriginal people, women, youth, people with disabilities, people of colour, immigrants and other groups (2010 Winter Games Inner – City Inclusive Commitment Statement, 2005, pg. 1).

The VA also recognizes through the ICICS the potential for the 2010 Winter Olympics Games to bring to the DTES:

a number of upcoming events and initiatives will also significantly benefit Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, and help achieve Vancouver Agreement vision and goals. These include: 2006 World Urban Forum, 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games including its Inclusive Commitment Statement. When the bid committee adopted an unprecedented Inclusive Commitment Statement, the Vancouver Agreement was instrumental in achieving this commitment, which will ensure that Downtown Eastside residents and businesses benefit from this major international event. Vancouver is the first Olympic Games host city to promote social and economic sustainability in all activities leading up to and during the Games (The Vancouver Agreement, 2005).

Therefore the ICICS can be seen as mechanism which binds stakeholders together including LGNOW, VANOC and VA. For VANOC, in order to address the goals outlined in the ICICS, it must work with community stakeholders. The first and obvious community stakeholder would be the VA, whose work is primarily focused on the social development, and community revitalization of the DTES.

The consequences of VANOC adopting the ICICS are many. First, VANOC is now accountable for fulfilling the ICICS to the International Olympic Committee (IOC),

since it was included as part of the winning bid submitted by the then Vancouver Bid Corp. VANOC is also accountable to the City of Vancouver because before the city formally announced its candidacy to bid for the Olympic Games, a city wide plebiscite was held in which residents voted to support the bid. Finally, VANOC is also accountable to its working partners including the VA, to reach the goals outlined in the ICICS.

1.2 Vancouver Downtown Eastside

Vancouver's DTES was singled out by the VA due to the growing concerns of business decline, unemployment, poverty, crime, drug use, all of which peaked in 1997 when the DTES was declared a public health crisis due to soaring HIV rates amongst intravenous drugs user (Vancouver Agreement, 2000; Vancouver Agreement, 2003; Vancouver Agreement, 2005e). The DTES includes seven inner city neighborhoods: Chinatown, Gastown, Oppenheimer, Strathcona, Thornton Park, Victory Square and Industrial for a combined population estimated by the 1996 Census of being over 16,275 (FERENCE & WEICKER, 2002, pg. 6). The "Community Assessment of 2010 Winter Olympic Games and Paralympic Games on Vancouver Inner – City Neighbourhoods" (2002) report also highlights considerable contrasts between the residents of the DTES and the rest of the city (FERENCE & WEICKER, 2002, pg 8). For example, compared to the city, residents of the DTES are generally older with a high population (63%) being males living alone. Most of this population (93%) lives in rental accommodation accounting for 80% for the city's single room occupancy units. Only 29% of DTES residents are employed compared to 50% of Vancouver residents (FERENCE & WEICKER, 2002, pg 11), with an average income of \$18,894 thus classifying 69% of the DTES population as

living on low income. This socio-economic profile and the concerns raised earlier have prompted the VA to prioritize the revitalization of the DTES first on its agenda. For VANOC, if it is indeed concerned with planning and hosting a more socially inclusive Olympic Games and adhering to the promises outlined in the ICICS, it would need to continue to work with the VA to address the revitalization of the DTES.

1.3 The Vancouver Agreement

The VA, established in 2002, is an urban development initiative focused on replacing the traditional silo – based approach to governance and service delivery with a more-integrated horizontal model based on collaboration and progressive problem-solving strategies (The Vancouver Agreement, 2005e). Founded by all three levels of government and involving multiple stakeholders including the Vancouver Police Department, the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, local business, and community partners, the VA is focused on promoting and supporting sustainable social, economic, and community revitalization of Vancouver’s inner city neighbourhoods with the aim of demonstrating how greater collaboration between stakeholders can produce long – term sustainable solutions to the challenges these communities face (The Vancouver Agreement, 2005e). Although the VA’s works with multiple stakeholders, including those already mentioned, only VANOC and 2010 LegaciesNow were the focus of this study because of their direct relationship to the Olympics.

The VA is governed by a small tri-level secretariat known as the Vancouver Agreement Secretariat (VAS) (The Vancouver Agreement, 2005). The first level of the secretariat is the ‘Policy Committee’ which has the primary responsibility of finalizing decisions. The Policy Committee is comprised of a provincial and federal appointed minister and the

Mayor of Vancouver. The second level is the 'Management Committee' which includes three representatives from the federal, provincial and municipal government who are responsible for guiding and communicating the Agreement's strategic planning and focus with the Policy Committee. The third level is the 'Coordination Team' which is the primary operational committee and works with 'Task Teams' (community, business and resident partners) on specific priorities including: economic development, employment, housing, drug addiction, and women's and youth initiatives. With \$20 million committed from both the federal and provincial government in April 2003, heritage preservation incentives from the City of Vancouver, increased funding from the DTES capital fund and in-kind goods and services, the VA's strategic plan includes goals to: increase economic development, improve the health of area residents and increase public safety by prioritizing four strategies that are related to economic and social development: economic development and job creation, dismantling the area's public open drug scene, turning problem hotels, particularly those that offer single room occupancy housing into safe, clean places to live and making the community safer for the most vulnerable, particularly women, youth and children (Vancouver Agreement, 2005e; Vancouver Agreement, 2003; Vancouver Agreement, 2000):

The efforts of the VA have been acknowledged through an Institute of Public Administration of Canada award in 2004 for innovative public service management (Vancouver Agreement, 2004, pg 1) and the United Nations Public Service Award in 2005 (Vancouver Agreement, 2005b, pg 1). In its short five year history, the VA has been seen as instrumental in improving the living conditions in the DTES. For example, it reports lower rates of violent and property crime, increased business applications,

landmark revitalization such as the Chinatown Millennium Gate and the Memorial Totem Pole, reduced HIV/AIDS infection rates, and fewer overdose deaths (The Vancouver Agreement, 2005e). Understanding how the organizing committee for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games and Paralympic Games can work with the VA to continue to address the social issues of the DTES via the 2010 Winter Games Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement is the focus of this study.

1.4 Purpose and Research Questions

Using stakeholder management theory, the purpose was to conduct a case study to examine how LGNOW, VANOC, and VA each prioritized their own and each other's role in the social development. The VA was identified as the focal organization because it is taking the lead in revitalizing the DTES, LGNOW and VANOC were identified as two of its many stakeholders.

The specific research questions were:

- 1) How do the focal organization (VA) and the stakeholders (LGNOW and VANOC) define the social development issue(s) underpinning their involvement in the VA?
- 2) How do the VA, LGNOW, and VANOC see their own role/interests and each other's role and interests in the VA?
- 3) What factors are facilitating or constraining the sustainability of the relationships between the VA, LGNOW, and VANOC?
- 4) What outcomes do the VA, LGNOW and VANOC hope to accomplish and how will these be assessed?

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 The Olympics and Social Development

Hall (2006) argues that the appeal for potential host cities of mega-events primarily lies in the opportunity provided in attracting and mobilizing capital and people towards developing economic, social, and physical legacies that last much longer than the event itself. A mega-event, such as the Olympic Games, is characterized as a discontinuous and out-of-the-ordinary event, which because of its large scale, can bring significant consequences to the host city including considerable mass popular appeal, international, and media exposure (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006).

Along with the financial costs to the host city, the social consequences of hosting such mega-events often includes the relocation or the outright eviction of existing infrastructures and the people it serves resulting in what Andranovich et al. (2001) describe as a “tourist bubble”.

In many cities there is a well – defined boundary separating tourist spaces from the rest of the city, creating tourist reservations that are secured, protected and normalized environments. While land use is contested in most cities, and the physical environment includes areas of poverty and decay, the tourist bubble reflects a romanticized, nostalgic sense of history and culture with a well crafted image of a the city displaying none of this conflict (p. 115).

Whitson and Horne (2005) add that such “tourist bubbles” also create “sociocultural bubbles” resulting in a social disconnect between the city’s affluent and less fortunate.

the ‘socio-cultural bubble’ in which many affluent people now live has insulated them from any real awareness of how people on wages – let alone social assistance – actually live, and hence of the impacts of neo-liberal social policies on their lives (Whitson & Horne, 2006).

Haxton (1999) argues that issues related to tourist and social ‘bubbles’ are primarily due to the diversion of public funds for private interests. He also argues that in cases where infrastructure and funding are diverted from social programs towards hosting such mega-events, communities must deviate from the “political approach” where community involvement is limited and move to a ”planning approach” where communities are actively engaged in the decision-making process (Haxton, 1999). With respect to the ICICS and the social redevelopment of the DTES, the decision making process appears to resemble Haxton’s “planning approach” where both VANOC and the VA are working together and with community stakeholders.

One such community stakeholder includes the Impact of the Olympics on Community Coalition (IOCC) which is an independent public watchdog of community organizations including: The Tenants Rights Action Coalition, Institute of Health Promotion Research, Better Environmentally Sound Transportation, Society Promotion Environmental Conservation, Vancouver and District Labour Council, British Columbia and Yukon Territory Building and Construction Trades Council, Think City Society, Southeast False Creek Working Group, Richmond Poverty Response Committee and Pivot Legal Society (IOCC, 2007). The IOCC has raised concerns over how the Olympic Games will socially impact Vancouver’s communities. In its report outlining recommendations Vancouver’s bid, the IOCC outlined seven key issues it deemed important to address which it hoped would be adopted if Vancouver were to be awarded the right to host the Olympic Games

- (1) The need for a province wide plebiscite to allow British Columbians the right to decide if to host the games, (IOCC, 2002, p. 4) along continuous updates of the true costs of the games and assurances that profits from the games be returned to

social programs benefiting all British Columbians to ensure the games are public and transparent (IOCC, 2002, p. 4).

- (2) Canada be in control of all security forces to ensure the safety of the athletes, spectators and the residents (IOCC, 2002, p. 4).
- (3) The need to improve the regional rail capacity and service through the creation of sustainable transportations based on environmental assessments for all major projects and the principle that those to benefit should shoulder the costs of those investments (IOCC, 2002, p. 4).
- (4) Community economic development be centered on both protecting small businesses and providing training and employment for local underemployed citizens and First Nations through the leveraging of community economic development initiatives (IOCC, 2002, p. 5).
- (5) To minimize environmental impacts by ensuring environmental legislation especially those directed at protecting the region's air and water quality are not vetoed in the name of Olympic development and that energy conservation strategies be adopted from the onset of planning for the Olympic Games (IOCC, 2002, p. 6).
- (6) The Charter of Rights and Freedoms is upheld with protocols in cooperation with the Vancouver Police Department to ensure the rights of homeless and other marginalized groups affected are upheld (IOCC, 2002, p. 6).
- (7) The need to create meaningful Olympic housing legacies by introducing single residency occupancy conversion and demolition regulations to prevent market driven displacements of primarily low-income tenants (IOCC, 2002, p. 7).

These recommendations are by no means exhaustive. However incorporating Haxton's concept of a "planning approach" to determine if and how these and future potential recommendations can be implemented by VANOC and the VA into community revitalization efforts of the DTES is significant, and more importantly, a missing gap in the literature.

Of the few works that focuses on the Olympic Games and community engagement, Ritchie has assessed community impact in his studies on the 1988 Winter Olympic Games in Calgary. His study (2000) that explored maximizing potential

opportunities associated with hosting the 1988 Calgary Winter Olympic Games, the benefits were strictly related to tourism and, not surprisingly, predominately centered on economics. His series of studies *Olympulse II – VI* (1984-1990) also examined community assessment but was limited to conducting telephone surveys to determine Calgarian resident's attitudes regarding the preparing, hosting, and post-Olympic Games. These studies were geared towards monitoring the viewpoints rather than including the residents in the decision making process. Although more Olympic bids are including a social development agenda, little research has been done on how they go about trying to achieve it.

After the United Nations (UN) Conference on Environment and Development in Rio De Janeiro in 1992, where many nations adopted the UN's "Agenda 21" and its goal for sustainable economic development, the IOC in 1996 adopted its own Agenda 21 into the Olympic Charter and proclaimed sustainable development as one of the fundamental objectives of the Olympic Movement (IOC, 2006). The International Olympic Committee's Agenda 21:

demonstrates the commitment of the Olympic Movement to protection of the environment and sustainable development. It establishes an action plan programme of sustainable development, and defines the responsibilities of its different members in implementing actions which respect the concept of sustainable development. It is aimed at the members of the Olympic Movement and all those involved in sport who share its values: IOC, IFs, NOC, OCOGs, athletes, clubs, and managers as well as those who practice sport and companies linked to sport (2006, p. 13).

Although Vancouver's bid to host the 2010 Winter Olympic Games included environmental sustainability measures to coincide with the IOC's Agenda 21, it could be argued that the ICICS was more instrumental in redefining "sustainable development" to include social development.

This study looked to address multiple gaps in the literature focused on the Olympics Games and social development. One goal was to understand the potential to applying Haxton's (1999) "planning approach" concept with respect to a mega-event. In this particular case study, the opportunity was provided to understand how VANOC was working towards addressing the social impacts of hosting an Olympic Games via its involvement in the VA. Because the Vancouver Olympics are still in the planning phase, this study offers an unique perspective by understanding how such social impacts were being addressed during the planning phase, unlike the majority of the existing literature that has examined economic impacts.

2.2 Theoretical Perspective

In order to gain an understanding the relationship dynamics of stakeholders who share a vested interest in a social development initiative, this study drew on stakeholder management theory while incorporating the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR). The stakeholders were identified as the VA, VANOC, and LGNOW, who are collaborating on the social development component of the revitalization efforts in improving the Downtown Eastside. To date, the overwhelming majority of the corporate social responsibility, stakeholder management and stakeholder theory literature has been from a business/managerial context, thus the frequent references to "the firm". In their review of 127 studies dating between 1972 and 2002, Margolis and Walsh (2003) found none that applied stakeholder theory to sport. Only recently has this gap begun to be addressed with the works of both Wolfe and Pulter (2002) and Friedman, Parent, and Mason (2004).

Wolfe and Putler (2002) used stakeholder theory to examine how different stakeholder groups of an American intercollegiate sports program prioritized their interests. The goal of the study was to determine if stakeholder groups indeed have homogenous interests. They concluded that although stakeholders may be homogenous in regards to a specific issue for example such as sport related fees, their priorities may not be. Friedman et al.'s (2004) study provided a framework for sport managers from various sectors of professional sport to improve their relationships with their respective stakeholders and address issues pertinent to each group. The framework outlined important considerations to the focal organization and stakeholders. However, none of these studies examined sport's role in social development.

In addition to Margolis and Walsh's review, aside from Wolfe and Putler's study, no stakeholder theory literature has been found that identifies the focal organization as a public organization. Although VANOC is technically a private organization and the VA is a publicly funded initiative, for the purposes of this study, both will be identified as organizations. Along with the contributions to the existing Olympic Games research that was discussed earlier in this chapter, this study will contribute to the stakeholder management and stakeholder theory literature by being the only if not the few studies that examines a public organization, and the role of sport in social development.

2.2.1 Corporate Social Responsibility

Society's call for organizations to become more socially conscious and consider the impact of their externalities is increasing. No such example is better than the IOC and Olympic host cities answering their critics calls by beginning to address the social impacts of hosting mega-sporting events. Drawing on the growing body of literature on

corporate social responsibility provides insight into what is motivating organizations and their stakeholders to contribute to more meaningfully to social development agendas.

Although defining CSR is difficult, Carroll (1991) suggests corporate social responsibility means:

address[ing] the entire spectrum of obligations business has to society, including the most fundamental – economic (p. 40).

He proposes that a spectrum of obligations can be depicted as a pyramid, built on the foundations of economic, legal, and then ethical responsibility. This pyramid, Carroll (1991) argues, allows a firm to achieve corporate philanthropic responsibility by encompassing:

the total corporate social responsibility of business entail[ing] the simultaneous fulfillment of the firm's economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities...the CSR firm would strive to make a profit, obey the law, be ethical and be a good corporate citizen (p. 43).

Maignan and Ferrell (2004) agree but expanded the definition to include:

obligation to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society...different types of social obligations can be distinguished: (a) economic obligations (be productive and economically viable), (b) legal and ethical obligations (follow the law and acknowledged values and norms), and (c) philanthropic obligations (proactively give back to society) (p. 4).

Corporate social responsibility can be characterized as an organization's attempt to spread the benefits by addressing the third party consequences to and with their stakeholders via organizational policies, programs, and actions.

If an organization acknowledges the need to heighten its social consciousness and address the third-party consequences of its actions, the firm must also address "whom" it must be socially responsible to. This question of where to begin and with whom is one Margolis and Walsh (2003, p. 285) also posed when they wrote:

to make sense of corporate responses to misery and discern the function of those responses, we need to understand which firms respond to which social problems, with what consequences, for both the firms and society.

Developing a framework to identify how CSR of organizations can be achieved by working on social development initiatives with other stakeholders requires consideration of stakeholder management and stakeholder theory.

2.2.2 Stakeholder Management

Although very closely aligned, stakeholder management and stakeholder theory are two different concepts. Whereas stakeholder management primarily focuses on examining issues surrounding an organization's societal responsibilities, stakeholder theory aims to provide the theoretical framework for such an examination (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997). Stakeholder management is considered to be the over-arching set of philosophies organizations should adopt in order to address the impacts of their externalities or "the effect of a transaction on a third party who has not consented to or played any role in the carrying out of that transaction" (Bakan, 2004, p. 61). It focuses on broadening:

management's vision of its roles and responsibilities beyond the profit maximization function to include [the] interests, and claims of non-stockholding groups (Mitchell et al., 1997, p. 855).

By adopting stakeholder management's vision into organizational practices, one is thought to be provided:

a systematic approach for conceptualizing, comprehending and analyzing external environment to facilitate our understanding of, and thereby our ability to manage within, increasingly unpredictable external environments (Wolfe & Putler, 2002, p. 64).

This approach includes "strategic and cognitive efficiency advantages" because it provides a more simplified and more comprehensible representation of the organization's world, through which it is better able to properly align its priorities against those it is

responsible to (Wolfe & Putler, 2002). This alignment results in organizations to be in a better position to shift their focus from strictly profit maximizing to incorporate economically, environmentally, and socially responsible agendas.

Critics question the validity and applicability of stakeholder management in a corporate setting because of the lack of interest in addressing the social and environmental impacts of its primarily economically driven actions that result in hostile corporate takeovers, downsizing and mergers, and acquisitions, executive compensation, and institutional investors. (Beaver, 1999). Conversely, advocates respond to such examples of firms attempting to maximize their economic gain while neglecting their social and environmental responsibilities are primary reasons why principles of stakeholder management must be adopted. In the case of the DTES, a community where personal, social, and health hardships are faced everyday, revitalizing this area of the city cannot simply be measured economically. It instead must also be assessed through the social and environmental impacts made on the daily lives of its residents, and this requires an investigation of how stakeholders are working together to foster improvements.

Where in the past Olympic host cities have fallen short in addressing social and environmental impacts, stakeholder management seems to be an applicable tool in understanding how the VA, LGNOW and VANOC can meet their individual yet intertwining goals of revitalizing the DTES hosting a socially inclusive Olympic Games. The business/managerial slant of stakeholder management acknowledges the reality for an organization to first address its economic responsibility, but also provide direction as to how it can also address its social and environmental responsibilities (Clarkson, 1995).

It seems stakeholder management may help to strike a balance for those voicing support and criticisms regarding an organization's economic agenda. For critics, it provides the opportunity to be identified as a stakeholder and therefore express concerns over how their Olympic Games should be hosted. For advocates, it provides the means to work with stakeholders in hosting a more socio-economic sustainable Winter Olympic Games, while still addressing its primary economic and financial responsibilities. By integrating corporate social responsibility, stakeholder management, and stakeholder theory, this study sought to understand how the latter could be accomplished.

2.2.3 Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory examines "how a firm relates to any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objective" (Margolis & Walsh, p. 279). Using stakeholder theory to understand the relationship between an organization and its stakeholders can return benefits including:

- (1) prescribing how managers can work with the firm's stakeholders;
- (2) explaining what managers have done in the past to stakeholder relationships;
- (3) predicting what will happen if managers adhere to stakeholder management principles (Wolfe and Putler, 2002, p. 64).

Whereas early stakeholder theory attempted to address these benefits within one theoretical approach, the three are now more commonly referred to as: normative, descriptive, and instrumental approaches (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Friedman et al., 2004; Margolis & Walsh, 2004). Using descriptive stakeholder theory to identify where organizations are currently positioned and using normative stakeholder theory to determine where organizations wish to be, instrumental stakeholder theory can be used to

link the two by emphasizing how other organizations have been able to successfully apply their visions of social responsibility into practice (Donaldson & Preston, 1995).

Outlining the moral and philosophical guidelines that firms can work towards achieving greater social responsibility, normative stakeholder theory is used to:

interpret the function of the corporation, including the identification of moral or philosophical guidelines for the operation and management of corporations (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71).

In contrast, descriptive stakeholder theory is used to examine the behavior of the firm including the way managers think, how board members consider the interests of its constituents, and how organizations in the end are actually managed.

The descriptive aspect of stakeholder theory reflects and explains past, present and future states of affairs of corporations and their stakeholders (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71).

Instrumental theory shows the link, or in some cases the lack of, between a firm and its stakeholders by making:

a connection between stakeholder approaches and commonly desired objectives...instrumental uses usually stop short of exploring specific links between cause and effect in detail but such linkage is certainly implicit (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71).

These three approaches combine to form part of the stakeholder theory framework.

Examining the current relationship between firms and their stakeholders (descriptive), how firms can work with their stakeholders (instrumental), and where firms and their stakeholders can go towards achieving greater corporate social responsibility (normative) provides the link between the theoretical and conceptual principles of stakeholder management.

2.2.3.1 The Focal Organization

Friedman et al. (2004) suggest the first stakeholder that should be identified is the organization at centre of the stakeholder relationship. Defined as the “focal organization”, this would be the organization wishing to address or heighten its own social responsibility by initiating engagement with its stakeholders. Friedman et al. (2004) contend that although the focal organization usually engages in a contractual relationship with its stakeholders, since each relies on the other for mutual self interest, “each actor [therefore can] be perceived as a stakeholder within the other’s stakeholder system” (p. 174).

Once the focal organization is acknowledged, Margolis and Walsh’s (2003) five-step descriptive model provides a framework for organizations participating in activities closely tied to social responsibility (Margolis & Walsh, 2003):

- Step One:** Appraise the stimuli: The need to understand which social ills garner attention from firms (p. 284).
- Step Two:** Generate response options: Once a problem has been identified, what are the potential solutions (p. 286).
- Step Three:** Evaluate options: Using an assessment criteria, measure each option (p. 287).
- Step Four:** Implementation: Decide and implement a response action (p. 288)
- Step Five:** Consequences: Determine the positive conditions which minimize the impact of the response option’s consequences (p. 289).

2.2.3.2 The Stake

Step one of Margolis and Walsh’s (2003) model relates very closely to Mitchell et al.’s (1997) concept of the “stake” or the issue to be addressed. Although the first step of the descriptive model is intended to develop a list of potential “social ills” the focal

organization can look to address Mitchell, Agle, and Wood's (1997) stakeholder identification model, which allows the focal organization to choose the one(s) it wishes. The model measures the stake against its stakeholder's priorities to determine which stakeholders are salient. To address the continued debate over legitimizing which stakes should have higher priority, Mitchell et al. (1997) attempt to strike a balance by arguing that:

the broad concept of stakeholder management must be better defined in order to serve the narrower interests of legitimate stakeholders. Otherwise, influencing groups with power over the firm can disrupt operations so severely that legitimate claims cannot be met and the firm may not survive. Yet, at the same time, it is important to recognize the legitimacy of some claims over others. Power and legitimacy, then, are necessarily core attributes of a comprehensive stakeholder identification model (p. 863).

2.2.3.2.1 Stakeholder Analysis Model

Returning to Walsh and Margolis' descriptive model, once the "stake" has been identified in step one, Wolfe and Putler (2002) argue for the inclusion of an additional stage, a process defined as "stakeholder analysis". This model is meant to identify appropriate stakeholders and how the focal organization should work with as it "attempts to classify stakeholders into categories that provide an understanding of how stakeholder groups can influence a firm" (Wolfe & Putler, 2002, p. 65).

- Step One:** Identify stakeholder roles
- Step Two:** Determine which stakeholders are salient
- Step Three:** Assess the priorities of individuals within the salient stakeholder groups
- Step Four:** Develop priority based clusters (i.e: place individuals into groups with relatively homogenous priorities)
- Step Five:** Cross clarify priority based and role based stakeholder groups
- Step Six:** In cases in which cross classification indicates that role – based stakeholders are diffused quite broadly across priority based clusters, profile the latter to determine a set of demographic or other characteristics that members hold in common.

Step 6 is specifically needed to determine a sequence of addressing priorities when communicating with salient stakeholders and the proper communication vehicles that should be used. This Stakeholder Analysis Model could ideally fit between the first step and second step in Walsh and Margolis' descriptive model of identifying the stake and generating response options.

2.2.3.3 Stakeholders

In order to properly identify a stakeholder as outlined in Step 2 of Wolfe and Putler's Stakeholder Analysis Model, Friedman et al. provide four prerequisites:

- 1) Stakeholder must have a connection to the organization
- 2) Stakeholder must represent definable
- 3) The definable interests entitle the stakeholder the right to exist in the stakeholder environment
- 4) Stakeholders may consist of a single or groups of people with similar interests including a single person or even the environment 2004, p. 174.

Burton and Dunn (1996) argue against identifying personified entities such as "the community" or "the environment" as stakeholders primarily because they cannot be offered money. However, Altman (2004) counters that such entities should be considered stakeholders since the taxes which the local governments use to fund non-profit organizations represent the government's stakeholders with viable economic interests. Altman (2004) explains that although they are often primarily geographic in nature, a community stakeholder does has mutual interests with the firm and as such, community

stakeholders can still be categorized as individuals or groups who are recognized or ignored by firms or groups.

Once a stakeholder has met the prerequisites, the second step of Wolfe and Putler's Stakeholder Analysis Model recommends that the focal organization classify:

persons or groups that have, or claim, ownership, rights or interests in a corporation and its activities, past, present or future. Such claimed rights or interest are the result of transactions with, or actions, taken by, the corporation, and may be legal or moral, individual or collective (Clarkson, 1995, 106).

According to their role with the organization, Clarkson (1995) identifies three stakeholder groups: primary, public or secondary stakeholder groups. Primary stakeholders (e.g.: shareholders and investors, employees, customers and supplies) are those:

without whose [continued] participation with the corporation cannot survive as a going concern...[and if a primary stakeholder] becomes dissatisfied and withdraws from the corporate system, in whole or in part, the corporation will be seriously damaged or unable to continue as a going concern (p. 106).

In relation to the social development initiative of revitalizing the DTES, both VANOC and LGNOW would be identified as primary stakeholders to the VA since either's withdrawal would seriously impact the VA's work.

Public stakeholders are defined as:

government and communities that provide infrastructure and markets, whose laws and regulations must be obeyed, and to whom taxes and other obligations may be due (p. 106).

Secondary stakeholders (eg. special interest groups):

influence or affect, or are influenced or are affected by, the corporation, but they are not engaged in transactions with the corporation and are not essential for its survival. ...the corporation is not dependent for its survival on secondary stakeholder groups. Such groups, however, can cause significant damage to a corporation (p. 107)

Defined Donaldson and Preston (1995) as "influencers", these stakeholders do not have a direct stake with the organization but they nonetheless can still affect the organization's decision making. For example, the media is not considered a primary or

secondary stakeholder because it lacks a stake with the organization, but may become involved on a given issue and use its ability to influence the general public. Therefore such groups must be considered as one of the focal organization's stakeholders.

Wolfe and Putler (2002) draw caution to Clarkson's notion that the stakeholder's role with the organization can be used as the criteria to classify it. They argue that traditionally stakeholders have been identified and categorized based on their connection with the organization and its stake. The problem emerges when the stake has been based on the stakeholder's role with the organization, a process defined as the "role primacy approach" (Wolfe & Putler, 2002). The limitation with using the role primacy approach is that such identifications and categorizations focus strictly on using self interest as the primary factor for determining the stakeholder's attitudes and interests resulting in homogeneous stakeholder groups and priorities. However in their study, Wolfe and Putler found heterogeneous stakeholder attitudes and interests existing within stakeholder groups and attributed this finding to the stakeholder's symbolic predispositions or "the learned affective responses to particular symbols that are acquired relatively early in life" (2002, p. 68). Since there is no underlying reason for stakeholders to have similar symbolic predispositions, the potential exists for a great deal of heterogeneity with respect to a stakeholder group's attitudes and interests (Wolfe & Putler, 2002). However, they do not suggest abandoning the role primacy affect altogether citing advantages of: aiding in determining the legitimacy, and saliency of a focal organization's stakeholder, identifying common attitudes, beliefs among stakeholders with similar roles which can often lead to a common set of stakeholder priorities and interests and developing a

method of communication to be used the focal organization for its stakeholders (Wolfe & Putler, 2002).

2.2.3.4 Stakeholder Saliency

Continuing from Step 3 from Wolfe and Putler's Stakeholder Analysis Model is Mitchell et al's (1997) Stakeholder Identification Model. which uses three intersecting variables to assess stakeholder saliency: power, legitimacy, and urgency.

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Power: | The extent it has or can gain access to coercive, utilitarian or normative means, to impose its will in the relationship...access to means is a variable, not a steady state, which is one reason why power is transitory: it can be acquired or lost (p. 865). |
| Legitimacy: | A generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and definitions (p. 866). |
| Urgency: | Based on the following two attributes (1) time sensitivity – the degree to which managerial delay in attending to the claim or relationship is unacceptable to the stakeholder and (2) criticality – the importance of the claim or the relationship to the stakeholder...the degree to which stakeholders claims call for immediate attention (p. 867). |

They explain that urgency must also be included because, if for example, a stakeholder possesses only power, although the stakeholder may be in a position to force its will, its claims will be illegitimate. In contrast, if a stakeholder is legitimate but without having power, it will never be heard. If a stakeholder possesses both power and legitimacy resulting in authority (power to enforce a value or belief), without urgency the stakeholder will not receive immediate attention. Based on time and criticality, Mitchell et al. (2004) argue urgency is the driver which moves the model from a static to dynamic state and increases a stakeholder's saliency. This saliency however can fluctuate since these stakeholders' attributes which are socially constructed and may not be consciously

possessed by the stakeholder at a given time, and can vary or change for any relationship (Mitchell et al., 1997, p. 868).

From these three overlapping attributes, Mitchell et al. (1997) describe how three different salient stakeholder types emerge: latent, expectant, and definitive. Latent stakeholders only possess one attribute, generally reflect a passive stance and are classified into three categories: i) dormant – only possessing power, ii) discretionary – only possessing legitimacy, or iii) demanding – only possessing urgency. Expectant stakeholders possess two attributes, are generally more active with the assumption their interests will be met, and can be classified into three categories: i) dominant – possessing both power, and legitimacy therefore their influence is assured and receive attention by the focal organization, ii) dangerous – having both power, and urgency and may become violent, and coercive in order to be heard, or iii) dependent – both legitimate and urgent but lacking power which forces these stakeholders to depend on more dominant stakeholders in order to be heard (Mitchell et al, (1997). The third type of salient stakeholders is labeled as definitive because they possess all three attributes of power, legitimacy and urgency resulting in maximum saliency. These stakeholders have a clear and immediate mandate and are therefore given priority by the focal organization due to their high saliency.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Methodology

Marshall and Rossman (1999) view case studies as the opportunity to “take the reader into the setting with a vividness and detail not typically present in more analytic reporting formats” (p. 159). They argue that such vividness can be achieved by examining organizational reports, programs and processes through historical or document analysis, interviews, and observations to focus in depth on specific instances of the phenomenon of interest. Acknowledging the organizational relationships between the VA, VANOC, and LGNOW in regards to their joint social development initiative is very unique and utilizing a case study methodology was therefore deemed to be appropriate. Data collection included using document analysis, elite face to face interviews, and field observations to triangulate data. Three data collection methods were used in this case study to achieve the primary advantage of applying multiple complimentary data collection methods and to have the methodologies compensate when one method falls short of achieving maximum results. This process of “triangulation” involved:

the comparison of results from either two or more data collection methods...on the assumption that any weaknesses in one method would be compensated by strengths in another (Mays and Pope, 2000, p. 94).

3.1.1 Document Analysis

The purposes of conducting a document analysis were two-fold. First, the document analysis helped to provide a historical and contextual understanding surrounding a specific setting by analyzing documents produced in the course of everyday events or constructed for the research at hand (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.

116). Second, as an unobtrusive method, it can portray the values and beliefs of participants in the setting... [and are] useful in developing an understanding of the setting or group studied” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 117). For this case study, the document analysis included each organization’s website, policy reports, public releases, and organizational publications which led to a greater awareness of the VA, VANOC and LGNOW’s mission, goals, and strategies in relation to their inter-organizational relationships, and the social development initiative. Documents were analyzed to first obtain important background information before conducting interviews and were later used to corroborate and compliment the interview data.

Marshall and Rossman (1999) identified two strengths of a document analysis. First, its very nature is both unobtrusive and non-reactive thus providing the researcher access without disturbing the natural setting in any way. Second, the documents analyzed can be re-analyzed by the reader and used as a basis for other data collected techniques, allowing the information and the manner in which the information was gathered to be verified.

These strengths were confirmed through the document analysis of the following:

Document Analysis Type	Title	Date
Website	www.vancouveragreement.ca	current
Policy Report	Vancouver Agreement - A Governance Case Study (Western Economic Diversification Canada)	2004
Policy Report	<i>Community assessment of 2010 Winter Olympic Games and Paralympic Games on Vancouver inner – city neighbourhoods.</i>	2002
Policy Report	A Strategic Plan	2003
Policy	A Framework for Action – A four pillar approach to drug	2000

Report	problems in Vancouver	
Media Release	Vancouver Agreement Wins United Nations Award	2005
Media Release	Downtown Eastside receives \$2 million to boost community's economy	2005
Media Release	Vancouver Agreement wins highest award for innovative public service management	2004
Media Release	Governments invest \$20 Million in the Downtown Eastside.	2003
Media Release	First Focus: The Vancouver Agreement.	2000

Figure 3.1 Document Analysis - Vancouver Agreement

Document Analysis Type	Title	Date
Website	www.vancouver2010.com	current
Policy Report	2010 Olympic Winter Games: Bid book for submission to the Canadian Olympic Association	1998
Media Release	Inner City Inclusivity: Update January 2006	2006
Media Release	2010 Inclusive Inner City Commitment Statement	2005

Figure 3.2 Document Analysis - VANOC

Document Analysis Type	Title	Date
Website	www.2010legaciesNow.Society.com	current
Media Release	Quick Facts	2006
Media Release	Chill snowboarding program for at-risk youth back for second year	2006

Figure 3.3 Document Analysis - 2010 Legacies Now Society

3.1.2 Semi - structured Elite Interviews

The second data collection method used in this case study included using semi-structured elite interviews. Along with complimenting the document analysis , the goal was to “go below the surface of the topic being discussed, explore what people say in as much detail as possible, and uncover new areas or ideas that were not anticipated at the outset of the research” (Britten, 1999, p. 13). By interviewing individuals directly involved in the VA, VANOC, and LGNOW, the goal was to gain an understanding of what each individual and organization deemed important in addressing the social development initiative. These individuals, as described by Rossman and Marshall (1999) are considered to be “elite” individuals who are:

those considered to be influential, prominent, and/or well-informed people in an organization or community; they are selected for interviews on the basis of their expertise in areas relevant to the research (p. 117).

The elite individuals proved invaluable because of their positions within each organization and roles related to the social development initiative. To recruit the elite interviewees, each organization was first provided with an ethics approved Agency Information Sheet (see Appendix B3), and an Agency Consent Form (see Appendix B2). Each interviewee was provided with an Initial Letter of Consent (see Appendix C1), Study Information Sheet (see Appendix C2), an ethics approved Participant Consent Form (see Appendix C3), and an organization specific organization interview question sheet (see Appendix D1, and D2) prior to each interview.

Upon receiving approved agency consent, interviewees in the three organizations were identified through purposive sampling. Purposive sampling aims to provide a deeper

understanding of a specific phenomenon rather than generalizing to a larger population. It is primarily used in circumstances where a researcher selects unique cases that are especially informative when individuals are within a specialized population and difficult to reach (Neuman, 2000). Selection of individuals as study participants was determined by using purposive sampling. The goal was to select at least one person per organization who had responsibility for the social development initiative. Below are lists that detail each participating organization and the eight individuals interviewed in this study. VANOC agreed to have only person interviewed, while four VA members and three LGNOW members agreed to participate.

Organization	Position
2010 Legacies Now Society	Chief Executive Office
	Special Advisor
	Manager of Inclusion
VANOC	Director of Social Sustainability and Inclusion
Vancouver Agreement	Executive Coordinator
	Chair – Vancouver Agreement Housing Task Team
	City of Vancouver Representative
	Vancouver Agreement Provincial Lead

Figure 3.4 Sample Selection

Each interviewee was asked between eight to ten open-ended questions with the goal to carry out what Britten (2000) describes as an “in-depth interview”. These semi-structured interviews allowed the interviewee to discuss a particularly broad area while ensuring that the research questions were fully addressed. To ensure accurate transcription, each

interview was audio recorded. Audio recording the interviews provided benefits including (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 186):

- reducing reactivity by the researcher;
- providing a more complete, concrete, and detailed record than fieldnotes, non-verbal aspects and features of the physical setting go unrecorded;
- decisions do not have to be made about what is to be noted, when and how;
- note taking interviews can prove disruptive;
- the interviewee may becoming self conscious if notes were being written down;
- and minimizing the researcher's attention spent on recording which then can be used to focus on the discussion between the interviewee

Upon each interviewee's consent, an interview was scheduled and in the end conducted at the interviewee's place of work. After each interview, fieldnotes were recorded to record additional information and an initial analysis (Neuman, 2000).

3.2 Data Analysis

All interviews were then transcribed verbatim and analyzed more thoroughly using Atlas.ti. This qualitative data software program provides the researcher with the ability to systematically categorize and code qualitative data under modifiable themes. Interviews were first transcribed into MS Word. A printout of each transcript was then used to analyze the data for common themes which were then created in Atlas.ti (Appendix E). With the coding themes inputted, the MS Word transcripts were transferred into AtlasTi and coded using open, first, second and axial systems. Open coding was conducted using labels to summarize sections of data. First-order coding labeled broader analytical topics under which second-order codes were used as subsets to determine common themes. The

axial codes were used to re-examine and potentially reconfigure relationships beyond the first order coding.

For example the following is one coding tree developed to analyze and code data. For this set of codes, “issues” is an example of an open code because the codes underneath it are a list of issues interviewees identified that need to be addressed in the downtown eastside. Examples of first order coding included: “another expo, community engagement/participation, false creek and the integration of”. “Integration of” was a specific first order code meant to highlight how all the administrators interviewed responded that addressing the social issues affecting the DTES cannot be isolated initiatives and that for needed success, these social issues must be organized into less siloed and more integrated approaches.

Examples of second order codes included: “help identify issues, implement strategies” which fall under the first order code of “community engagement”. “Accessible games, civil liberties and employment” are examples of second order codes under the open code of “Issues” and the first order code of “Integration of”. Axial codes included the final set of codes (e.g. “job training, jobs, management, and welfare) because they also related to economic development which was identified through the interviews as another entirely different code tree.

ISSUES:

ISSUES: another expo	Open Code
ISSUES: community engagement/participation to	First Level Code
ISSUES: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/PARTICIPATION TO: help identify issues	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/PARTICIPATION TO: implement strategies	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: False Creek	First Level Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF:	First Level Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: accessible games	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: civil liberties	Second Order

Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Employment	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: job training:	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: jobs	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: management	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: welfare	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Health	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HEALTH: ADEQUATE HEALTHCARE	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HEALTH: DRUG ADDICTION	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HEALTH: LACK OF: MEDICAL/DENTAL FACILITIES	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: homelessness	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Housing	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: HOUSING - foundation of social development	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: poor condition of housing stock	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: sro bylaw	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: supportive housing	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: mental illness	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: MENTAL ILLNESS: CLOSING OF RIVERVIEW	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: MENTAL ILLNESS: MISDIAGNOSIS	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Prostitution	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Safety	Second Order
Code	
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: SAFETY: CRIME	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: SAFETY: PROVIDING SAFE/HEALTHY PLACE TO LIVE	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: SAFETY: REDUCING CRIME	Axial Code
ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: transportation	Second Order
Code	

Figure 3.5 – Example of coding scheme

These multiple coding systems ensured the data was thoroughly analyzed determine proper and appropriate common sub themes and eventual main themes to ensure (Strauss, 1994):

- centrality: determining if the theme central to topic of interest;
- frequency: if the theme is mentioned by multiple respondents;
- interrelatedness: is the theme connected to its others;
- theoretical implications: is there support for the findings under the chosen theme; and
- allowance of maximum variation: does the theme encompass both positive and negative cases.

Hine (2000) addresses the potential issue of reaching data saturation; the extent to which the information gathered is sufficient, by arguing that no study can be holistic, but that the best way to address this issue is to apply multi-dimensional approaches.

Rearticulating the notion of triangulation, by utilizing two different sources of data collection, it was believed sufficient data was about to be uncovered to address the research questions.

3.3 Judging the quality of the data

Maintaining trustworthiness or sound qualitative research is imperative in any study. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), trustworthiness can be judged by four criteria;

- credibility: “the reconstruction that have been arrived at via the inquiry are credible to the constructors of the original realities” (p. 296);
- transferability: the extent to which “sufficient descriptive data to make such similar judgements elsewhere” (p. 298);
- dependability: the extent to which “the findings of an inquiry [can] be repeated if the inquiry were to be replicated with the same subjects in the same context” (p. 290); and
- confirmability: the extent to which “the findings are grounding in the data [and] the inferences based on are logical” (p. 323).

Although data may be judged according to these criteria, one must acknowledge that none of these issues be completely resolved. One potential contribution this study identifies is the opportunity to add to the stakeholder theory and stakeholder management literature since this study is one of the few which focuses specifically one stakeholder relationships involving sport and social development. Because the relationships between the Vancouver Agreement, VANOC, and LGNOW in this study are seen as stakeholder

relationships, it is possible that the dynamics of these relationships could be transferred to understand stakeholder relationships in similar contexts. Another limiting factor of understanding social phenomenon is the constantly changing context making dependability over time challenging. Although every attempt was made as a researcher to ground the analysis in the data, one acknowledges that this was shaped by my social location.

3.4 Role of the Researcher

The subjectivity of the researcher and research process can be considered in relation to the concept of researcher reflexivity which is defined by Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) as:

the orientations of researchers [shaping] their socio-historical locations, including the values and interests that these locations confer upon them. What this represents is a rejection of the idea that social research is, or can be, carried out on some autonomous realm that is insulated from the wider society and from the particular biography of the researcher in such a way that the findings can be unaffected by social processes and personal characteristics. Also, it is emphasized that the production of knowledge by researchers has consequences (p. 16).

Reflexivity acknowledges that truth is not absolute nor can it be entirely attained.

Acknowledging the dynamic environment in which the researcher applies his or her own lens to carry out social research and dynamism it produces is the first step. As a researcher, I must acknowledge my own personal background beginning as a male visible minority from a very small town with its own socio-economic problems, and moving to Vancouver to attend university and obtaining a Bachelors of Human Kinetics in Leisure and Sports Management and Commerce and now attending graduate school. I must also acknowledge my personal experience in sports and recreation including volunteering for the campus intramural program, participating in the graduate intern program where I

interned at 2010 Legacies Now Society in my first year. I was also board member for the the Impact of Communities Coalition and its representative on the Sports and Recreation Sectoral Table. Currently I am in the position as the Coordinator for LEAP BC at 2010 Legacies Now in the early children's literacy and education division. While these various roles have provided with insights and access to study participants who otherwise may not have been involved, my background does shape my analysis in was that study participants may or many not agree with.

3.5 Limitations

Although the procedures for conducting a document analysis are relatively straight forward, there are limitations primarily regarding issues of privacy, accessibility, feasibility, and reliability. Public documents do not always reflect actual practices, so their analysis represents a starting point to be elaborated upon in the interviews. In cases where information is available online, these resources are available to anyone with access to the internet; therefore issues of privacy, accessibility, and feasibility are non-existent. Another potential issue that may arise is that of reliability, in particular, the contentious matter of the literature's source; the idea that one "could be misled by relying on the re-representations of others" (Hine, 2000, 44). Even Hines (2000), who asks the very question, addresses it when discussing the authenticity of interactions in electronic space:

standards of authenticity should not be seen as absolute, but are situationally negotiated and sustained. Authenticity, then, is another manifestation of the 'phenomenon always escapes' rule...A search for truly authentic knowledge about people or phenomenon is doomed to ultimately irresolvable...this also entails accepting that 'the informant' is a partial performance rather than a whole identity (p. 49).

Along with Hine's (2000) issues of authenticity in interviewing prominent figures, potential limitations included: getting in contact and actually be able to interview, adapting the interview to someone who is savvy and may try to avoid certain questions,

and meeting the demands of trying to interview a prominent figure (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 113).

Accessibility issues in this study were resolved by knowing a contact, or as Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) describe as a “gatekeeper” who is a powerful figure with access to people or information provide will make this obstacle less so. But because of the political context in which this study was conducted and the issues this study attempted to address including the Olympic Games, which have always been very political due to the financial and social and issues surrounding homelessness, poverty and marginalized groups, this study did face the potential of interviewees avoiding certain questions as a second limitation. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) offered a potential solution to interviewees who attempt to avoid certain questions within reason, allowing the interviewee to control the context. They argue that:

with many people, interviewing them on their own territory, and allowing them to organize the context they way they wish is the best strategy. This allows them time to relax more than they would in less familiar surroundings (p. 150).

Along with contextual control, this study offered a second solution to interviewing those who have already had informal conversations regarding the study and had agreed to be involved in the study. However, it was noted in the fieldnotes after the interviewees that in some cases the issues were not addressed and that in some cases were deflected by the interviewee. Although this is understandable due to the political context of the study, it did become a limiting factor in the study. But it should also be noted be noted that many of the responses were appeared to be genuine.

Issues of privacy and confidentiality were also applicable. By reiterating assurances of confidentiality, the freedom to withdraw at any point during the interview, to state to the interviewee his/her participation is strictly voluntary and that s/he will remain completely anonymous to all of the participants in the study before, during and after the interview. However the main limitation to this study was that by only interviewing administrators at VA, VANOC and LGNOW, the perspective of stakeholders who are or could be affected are neglected. This limitation however opens the door for future research.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Results

The primary goal of this study was to understand the inter-organizational relationship between the Vancouver Agreement, VANOC, and LGNOW as they relate to the social development component of the Downtown Eastside revitalization. The results are presented below in relation to each research questions posed. The first research question was: How do the focal organization (VA) and the stakeholders (VANOC and LGNOW) define the social development issues underpinning their involvement in the VA.

4.1 Social Development

Each administrator was asked to define the social development issues that they thought needed to be addressed through their joint involvement. Despite the fact that social development was described similarly by administrators within each organization, it was viewed somewhat differently across organizations. Common issues identified included highlighting and promoting the positive aspects of the downtown eastside, addressing the negative social issues affecting the area, and the need for an integrated approach centered on economic, social, and health strategies. The next sections illustrate the perspectives of the focal organization and its stakeholders in more detail.

4.1.1 Vancouver Agreement

The Vancouver Agreement administrators identified capacity building as an important component to social development but this was viewed primarily in terms of community consultation (VA Administrator 3). One administrator discussed how during the bid phase, when social implications of hosting the games were not significantly identified, the City of Vancouver

members of the VA began internal discussions which later progressed to include local community service groups. This led to the identification of some of the social and economic implications of hosting the games. The administrator suggested that their goal was to use this opportunity to both address the community identified issues, while at the same time make the Vancouver bid unique by positioning it as being more socially inclusive with a higher priority on the social agenda in comparison to other bid cities. The opportunity was deemed successful when the issues were used to create the basis of the ICI statements, which were adopted into the bid book. This was believed by some to subsequently help Vancouver win the games (VA Administrator 1).

A second administrator discussed how during the VA's infancy, the Vancouver Agreement engaged in a year long consultation with members of the community, which allowed it to overcome legitimacy issues and create a framework for engagement with the same community that had seen significant cuts in governmental social services. These groups viewed the Vancouver Agreement as yet another example of a governmental program that would come and go (VA Administrator 3). Even when the VA was finalized in 1999, the administrator spoke of how critical the community engagement process was and what it meant to have it when the VA became official:

“One of the things that's really important to identify is that people live the experience in the downtown eastside and its one thing for governments to identify the need to come together and work together, but you need to do it on a platform of legitimacy from the community, both residents, community organizations, business owners in the downtown eastside. So part of what was identified through some of the leaders within the respective levels of government was the need to engage very strongly with where communities are at and get their perspectives of what the key issues were for them in trying to live in the community, raise a family in the community or do business in the community. Challenges such as the public safety, homelessness increased that I mentioned, so there was an elaborate, very elaborate, very comprehensive public engagement process in the leading up to the signing of the agreement and I would say that's absolutely a critical success factor, is making sure you got the foundation right in terms of what you are trying to address and that the vision for change is shared not just by governments but all, as many

parts of the community that you are trying to work with and work for (VA Administrator 3).

With the community consultation process in mind, VA administrators all agreed that the social development component of the DTES should be based on an integrated approach with economic, social, and health strategies designed to revitalize the community and also address the issues affecting any given individual. As one administrator described:

the social is very much around the health and safety stuff – the employment, the housing. All of that to me, it's all one whole package of social development because you can't develop socially unless you have a viable economic market and people don't have places to live and they are not healthy. So I see it very much as an integrative approach both economically and socially (VA Administrator 2).

The administrators specifically identified employment, housing, health and drug addiction and safety as the key social issues. But as one administrator discussed, the importance of addressing these social issues lies in finding integrated services which is challenging when such services are often fragmented.

I really support case coordination but so often you're working in the health system with an individual to try to get them to access to health support. How do we work within the employment sector to make sure that person has an opportunity to be successful in employment? How do we work with that same person within the housing sector to make sure that their housing, health and employment are all integrated and they get the supports they need across those supports? (VA Administrator 3).

This integration of services aimed to stabilize an individual was viewed by all VA administrators as the most important aspect of the social development component. As with the LGNOW, an administrator within the VA cautioned about the potential problems with revitalizing the DTES:

The overriding objective of the Vancouver Agreement is to encourage revitalization without displacement of the low income community and that is a very difficult but achievable balancing between various different interests. So one hand you want to encourage more business in the area, the more people living in the area who can, who have money to spend and are going to be part of a more vibrant community. But on the other side you also want to maintain the community for low income people as tradition that's been ruled the downtown eastside (VA Administrator 1).

4.1.2 VANOC

VANOC also identified capacity building as an important part to the social development component of the initiative. Capacity building was defined as building infrastructure within or on existing community structures in order to provide a voice for the community, which would then subsequently be used to allow for VANOC and the community to work together and gain clarity on how to deal with specific issues such as health or housing (VANOC Administrator). Although the VANOC administrator identified capacity building as the most significant aspect of its social development involvement, he did discuss it as centering specifically around the ICI statements and the sectoral tables which were designed to address the goals outlined in the ICIS. This community capacity building was described by VANOC as the best way for it to both address the ICI statements and cement a social legacy, especially since the organizing committee would be dissolved in 2011 after the games are hosted. He added that for VANOC to initialize programs, knowing that they would not exist in 2011, was socially unsustainable:

The other key factor when you look at why we are doing it the way we are, at the end of the games, VANOC is no longer here so for us, its important that we work with existing structures and to go back to the earlier comment is to build that capacity so individuals or groups or structures within the community can continue dealing with the issue after the games are over (VANOC Administrator).

4.1.3 2010 Legacies Now Society

LGNOW administrators primarily viewed the social development of the DTES as an opportunity to use the Olympics as a platform for engagement to further examine the issues affecting this problematic geographical area. Although programs and policies do exist to address the “stereotypical” and media focused social issues affecting the DTES such as homelessness, health and crime, their focus centers on balancing the equation by identifying strategies that look to improve the quality of life in the DTES. This was designed to change the culture of the

community and for “people [to] understand the other things that [are] being done besides just the hot topic” (LGNOW Administrator 2). All LGNOW administrators discussed the need to build capacity within the community by actively engaging and working with community partners, to allow for citizen involvement, and to give members a sense of ownership. The need to feel proud about their community again and to realize that an entirely other community exists beyond that of the one portrayed through the media was another key issue raised (LGNOW Administrator 2). LGNOW administrators also described the cultural and historical heritage of the DTES as being important. This included once being a prominent residential community for seasonal miners and loggers, being the centre of multiple cultural communities including Chinatown and Japantown, as well as being home to a very strong core group of senior citizens (LGNOW Administrators 1 and 2).

The people of the DTES were specifically identified for their strong community spirit. However a LGNOW Administrator discussed that although revitalizing the downtown eastside would be a phenomenal achievement, its successfulness hinges on how well these people are engaged in the process:

If you look at the downtown eastside, it didn't happen overnight and you know revitalizing the downtown eastside won't change over night either. It will take time for that to happen and how do you get the right balance to ensure that the people who live in there really get the feel it's their community and not have the whole thing change because of revitalization (LGNOW Administrator 2)

4.1.4 Key Social Issues Affecting Downtown Eastside

All the administrators from the three organizations identified key issues they hoped to spotlight with the hosting of these Olympics Games. First, they referred to the past failures associated with Expo '86, including the displacement of DTES residents, as an example of what to avoid with these Olympic Games (LGNOW Administrator 1). They also wanted to ensure that

the Games are accessible to members of the community to view as spectators and that the community's civil liberties will be protected. In terms of revitalization, the administrators were adamant that economic revitalization efforts be sustainable and that social issues around health, homelessness, housing, reducing crime and improving safety are addressed.

4.1.4.1 EXPO '86

All administrators discussed that they, their organizations, and most importantly, the citizens of Vancouver are all too familiar with the failures associated with hosting Expo 86. All administrators recognized Vancouver's failure to adequately address the social issues that emerged during that event, citing specifically the deaths of some homeless DTES residents, many of whom were evicted hotel residents. Many hotel managers during Expo opted to renovate in order to generate greater revenue with tourists. This is a prime example of what these administrators wish to avoid with the Olympic Games.

With another major event coming to Vancouver, one VA administrator discussed four specific outcomes that were developed in order to address these concerns during the bid phase. Firstly, she described the ICI Workgroup - a group of 22 members from the community and government who both supported and opposed the Games (FERENCE & WEICKER, 2002). Each member was asked to participate in the workgroup, regardless of their position on the Games, in order to adequately address the social issues that may arise if Vancouver was, in fact, awarded the Games. She noted the overwhelming positive response because the community groups were working with members from government who had long worked in the DTES and were quite familiar with the community. Secondly, she highlighted the success of the OpportunitiesNow Initiative, which included \$50,000 towards a pilot project to examine potential training and employment opportunities via the Olympic Games which coincidentally align with the ICI

statements. This helped to demonstrate that such opportunities could coincide with the Olympic Games. The third outcome was the community impact assessment report conducted by Ference and Weicker (2003) which evaluated the potential social impacts associated with hosting the Games. The final outcome was the developments of the ICI Commitment Statements, which was a difficult process because the community wanted assurances and the government wanted to provide them, but they could only go so far. However in the end, having the statements adopted into the Olympic bid book was a huge step forward according to VA Administrator 1.

All administrators agreed that community concerns based on experiences with Expo '86 would continue to be heard and addressed up until the hosting of the Games. They also agreed to the need to continue community consultation and to use that as the foundation for the successful planning and hosting of these games. A LGNOW Administrator touched on this issue by discussing the key organizational failures of Expo 86:

I mean at the end of Expo there was no post games plan and so you learned that a lot that did work on Expo a lot of them are still around, still involved in this project so we kind of blew it at the end of Expo. I mean we didn't really think of a longer term you know? We had property development down there on the north side of False Creek but we really didn't do anything right as fast as we could of (LGNOW Administrator 1).

The administrator reiterated the same point with these Games - that to avoid the social failures this time, long term planning and consultation strategies with the DTES community must occur (LGNOW Administrator 1).

4.1.4.2 Accessibility and Civil Liberties

Both LGNOW and VANOC administrators identified unequivocal access for residents living in communities impacted by the hosting of the Games as a key working point within the VA (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 2, VANOC Administrator). VANOC defined accessibility as “a means for individuals from the inner city who would otherwise not be able to attend or participate in the games” (VANOC Administrator). This extends to developing a strategy for

providing adequate and affordable transportation for the community, distributing 50,000 tickets to DTES residents, as well as identifying opportunities for them to participate within the Olympics arts and culture activities. As the administrator explained:

At the same time individuals want to take advantage of the Games and the Games are sometimes more challenging if you don't have the finances do deal with the Games and therefore we are looking at ways to ensure that individuals from the inner city get access to the Games... as observers as well as potential arts and culture activities that count to the Games as well so looking at opportunities there as well (VANOC Administrator).

Although for VANOC, the sectoral tables on accessibility and transportation are still in future plans, the goal remains to meet these ICI commitments as outlined in the bid book.

VANOC and the VA administrators also specifically said this accessibility commitment touches closely on a second commitment, surrounding civil liberties and the right to protest (VANOC Administrator, VA Administrator 1). Citing Vancouver's history including most recently the Eagleridge Bluffs and the False Creek Olympic Village protests, VANOC insisted that individual's civil liberties would be protected. Administrators within LGNOW and the VA also mentioned civil liberties as another ICI commitment statement that they would work with VANOC on, but did not elaborate further.

4.1.4.3 Economic Revitalization

Each administrator within LGNOW, VANOC and VA discussed the need for an integrated approach, including a focus on economics, in order to revitalize the DTES. While all VA administrators discussed how business decline, empty store fronts, and an increase in pawnshops and other illegal businesses in the area created an economic climate that only fueled the social decline of the community, a VA administrator mentioned that there are signs of economic improvements. But she explained that revitalizing the community to its full potential is still years away:

It takes many many years for communities to get into the kind of decline that the downtown eastside has. I've heard a figure of 30 years to change inner cities in the US, so that's important to see the trends, be celebratory, that the work of the Vancouver Agreement and many other agencies are trying to create change in the community. But it's a long road ahead of us (VA Administrator 3).

She commented that with such a long timetable, the expectation has been and will continue to be for things to progress faster than they are. However, the reality is such goals need to be both realistic yet flexible. Citing examples of the 2010 units of social housing by 2010, or 2010 employment opportunities with the Games, she said that although everyone would like to see these goals reached, the likelihood is that they won't be fully achieved. Therefore, she warned that everyone involved needs to brace for when such lofty goals do not materialize. Another VA administrator discussed the difficulties of managing such high expectations:

But also manage expectations because I think expectations are very high, running very high in different parts of the community...I think people would like to see 2010 units of housing. That's not doable. A thousand people employed in long term sustainable jobs. When you are dealing with the face of people in the downtown eastside you know, a thousand people being stabilized over the next four years as a result of the inclusive Olympics, that would be an incredible accomplishment. I would see that as a stretch goal rather than something that's probably realistic when you think of what you need for people who long term have been unemployed. You need to have the house supports lineup for them usually, you need to have safe, affordable and stable housing and you need to have employment that is targeted at where somebody is at in order to succeed. Maybe it is 5 hours a week that somebody is capable or maybe its 35, but you have to have the different places (VA Administrator 3).

The administrator touched on aspects shared by other administrators within the VA, LGNOW and VANOC. First, all administrators agreed that the economic strategy is only one aspect of the revitalization and that without a stable community, one where individuals are able to overcome their personal issues or addictions with appropriate support systems, the economic strategy will fail. Second, all VA administrators agreed that the DTES has unique challenges compared to other parts of Vancouver and Canada and therefore success needs to be measured quite differently. For example, employment may not include a traditional 40 hour work week, but

rather a range beginning at just five hours per week or even possibly include working within a volunteer capacity. As such, expectations with respect to the DTES may need to be realigned (VA Administrator 2, and 3). This sentiment of expectations was shared by a LGNOW administrator who mentioned that 2010 Legacies Now Society's involvement includes working on both ends of the unemployment issue to identify potential employment opportunities with appropriate work week hours. In conjunction with this, they are examining ways to increase education within the community, while at the same time ensuring appropriate sponsors (LGNOW Administrator 1).

The VA Administrators identified the goals of their economic strategy to include: generating employment opportunities, increasing demand for DTES products and services, and ensuring that businesses can deliver them (VA Administrator 3). The VA administrator alluded to sponsorship as a means to reach these goals by referring to its corporate engagement strategy and the \$2 million dollar sponsorship agreement between the VA and Bell employment program that looks to identify potential employment opportunities within the DTES (VA Administrator 2, 3, and 4; LGNOW Administrator 1; VANOC Administrator). Yet, as a VA administrator cautioned, further corporate engagement within the DTES will only happen when the community can demonstrate that it is a stable environment to invest in:

I mean the corporate side will be on economic development but that economic development can only happen if you can bring some order down to the streets right? Who's going to invest the money? If you look at the business in the downtown eastside now, a lot of them are illegal businesses. They are the dollar pizza shops that basically sell drugs behind the counter....so if you have money, will you invest in the downtown eastside? You won't right now but when you see the order back onto the streets, there are things happening, people are stabilizing, because also whoever is doing business in there, you also have to rely on your local neighbourhood to pay the buying power right? You whether it's a restaurant, so it's more difficult unless the whole community is in better shape (VA Administrator 4).

According to a VA administrator, the key in all this is to identify the gaps and opportunities present in such initiatives and to develop realistic and flexible goals with the public that can easily be measured, conveyed to and understood by the public (VA Administrator 3).

LGNOW identified the goals of its economic strategy to include increasing accessible education to individuals within the community, increasing employment opportunities within the downtown eastside, and to further engage Olympic corporate sponsors to invest in the downtown eastside (LGNOW Administrator 1).

The VANOC administrator referred to its two current employment projects – its procurement strategy and the Benefits Agreement. The procurement strategy focuses on purchasing goods and services from the DTES, including office supplies and catering services. The Benefits Agreement is a clause within its venue construction agreements that looks to include economic and employment opportunities with the DTES. Examples of such employment opportunities include requiring a certain percentage of the workforce be from the downtown eastside (VANOC Administrator). The administrator continued to comment that with venue construction beginning next year, identifying such opportunities with respect to the DTES has moved to the forefront of its economic agenda (VANOC Administrator).

4.1.4.4 Housing and Homelessness

When asked for the key social issues affecting the downtown eastside, all administrators returned with housing. Although each organization mentioned the need for continued support towards social housing, the VA administrators provided the greatest detail regarding the current situation in the DTES. One VA administrator commented that without a roof over one's head, a person is left to the streets and is likely to succumb to an environment of crime, drug abuse, and prostitution (VA Administrator 4). Although social housing is considered to be foundational, cuts

in governmental social housing programs and stagnant welfare rates have greatly contributed to the current low housing stock in the DTES (VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4).

A second VA administrator mentioned that currently Vancouver has approximately 5,000 units of social housing - almost half of where the VA would like its social housing stock to be (VA Administrator 2). However, both VA administrators agreed that not only is the condition of the housing stock poor and rapidly declining, but options to renovate create additional problems, such as where to provide temporary housing to residents during the renovation process. In conjunction with this, options to rebuild can create even greater displacement issues, especially when combined with Vancouver's currently accelerated real estate market (VA Administrator 2, and 4). They discussed how the City of Vancouver is trying to address the market situation with its own endowment fund, how zoning and incentives specifically for social housing education courses and training for hotel owners are underway, and how delivery for on site support services to residents are being organized. But, as the second administrator described, these programs and policies are not entirely effective:

Well, you know what's interesting because we've had one project that is up and running. We're actually having a tough time getting a take up on the second and third hotel and part of that could be is that people are saying, first of all it's a tough market, people are getting old who are running these places. But also they are also saying, gee maybe I just want to get out of this business itself, sell the building. And so why is that happening in Vancouver and the Olympics of course is a piece of that (VA Administrator 2).

They also described how the City of Vancouver has enacted a Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Bylaw to prohibit the conversion of social to market housing including charging hotel owners \$5000/unit of housing that would be converted as a financial deterrent. Both believe the SRO Bylaw is a good policy to prevent certain issues that can potentially arise in the social housing market in the downtown eastside but, that greater impact can be made at the provincial and federal policy level (VA Administrator 2 and 4).

All VA Administrators discussed the need for the federal government to reinstate the funding for the social housing program it once provided. They also stressed the need for the provincial government to continue to support social housing initiatives, including increasing current welfare rates which have remained stagnant for the past 15 years and for supportive housing whereby residents are provided with onsite services and counseling throughout the day. Although supportive housing is deemed by all VA administrators as by far one of the most important social housing services needed in the DTES, a VA administrator discussed the range of social housing in the following::

Well there's a whole range of what is needed for social housing. For people who can live totally independently, the only issue they've got is not enough money but they may have a job, it's a poor paying job, that you know, pretty much income is their only challenge in life. And so there's lots of that kind of social housing throughout the city, seniors housing where again people just by income otherwise just are fit in, and then there's kind of a range of different ways in which housing can be supported. So some of it is very intensive support...so there isn't one particular model I think there's a whole range in which social housing could be developed. We need all that...and you know it varies over time (VA Administrator 1).

She also continued to speak of non profit housing services such as Lookout, Neighbourhood Development Society, Portland Hotel Society and Four Sisters, who have been able to go beyond social housing and are venturing into providing appropriate banking and affordable childcare to the community.

Although LGNOW Administrators identify housing and homelessness as one of the most significant social issues affecting the DTES, their organization's realm does not include housing and therefore its role with the VA is very minimal. VANOC on the other hand, has identified housing as an aspect that it should be involved in through its ties to the ICI statements outlined in the bid. Yet VANOC acknowledged that while the issue of housing and homelessness is important, other partners including the federal, provincial, and municipal governments have

jurisdiction beyond the promise made of 250 units of social housing in the False Creek Olympic Village:

If you back to the community, there are different multiple views on why and how and what is the end result on that so I think that's the challenge that we all have. There is a lot of interpretation that takes place in any community and even greater interpretation I think gets placed on a lot of the issues of the downtown eastside and there's multiple strategies on how to deal with the homeless issues and how to deal with some of the housing issues downtown eastside and how to deal with some of the strategies around that. VANOC doesn't own that, there are other strategies that need to be in place, there are other partners that need to address that, so it's a much larger issue than strictly a VANOC issue....our goal from VANOC is to ensure that individuals are not displaced because of the Games and that's part of the commitment that we've made and part of our commitment that we've also made was to ensure that we also left a housing legacy behind and our commitment to the village of 250 units, that will be left after the Games for social housing as part of our commitment that we've already met (VANOC Administrator).

4.1.4.5 Health

In 1998, the Vancouver DTES was in the midst of a public health crisis and issues surrounding rising HIV/AIDS incidents, drug abuse, and prostitution began receiving greater public and media attention. The Vancouver Agreement continues to address these health issues, yet as VA administrators discussed, health is one aspect of a very integrated and complex social dynamic.

The two major health issues affecting the DTES continue to be mental illness and drug abuse. One VA administrator cited the closing down of Riverview Psychiatric Hospital and the attempt to put people back into the community with the patients receiving their medications and services at home, as a catalyst to the current mental illness crisis:

Even on issues on if you look at closing down Riverview, the concept of closer to home, the staffing closer to home initiative, and then putting people back into the community. On paper it looks good but then some of these people can't even function by themselves so you put them out there and also the problems are the care and support never came. They are supposed to be moving back into the community attached with a package of care and support and that never materialized and on your own. After two or three months they stop taking medication and they are not well again (VA Administrator 4)

With individuals not taking their required medication, the administrator continued to describe a cycle of dual diagnosis:

Since the closing down of Riverview we see more and more people with mental illness. The ones down there, they are not taking their medication and they become dual diagnosis, they have mental illness and they become drug addicted. So the issue becomes more and more complex (VA Administrator 4).

She suggested that such individuals with dual diagnosis, and because they lack appropriate access to healthcare services and their welfare support is not enough to buy the necessary medication, they can become unstable and harmful to him/her self or others. This eventually leads to the individual being evicted from his/her home and left to live in the streets (VA Administrator 4). When asked what needs to be done, all VA administrators discussed how 20 years of poor government policy, including closing down health centers, inadequate medical services, stagnant welfare rates, poor social housing policy and funding has largely contributed to the social state of the area. While improving and integrating these policies will not improve the DTES overnight, it was seen as a necessary step for revitalization:

Well to change policy...they will change the welfare policy ASAP right? I mean there are other policies. Policy for example, what we are pushing for is an integration of addiction and mental health right, so you don't get it, or if you're mentally ill, okay your mentally ill but you don't really fit into addiction. We are saying that, it's the same person. You know the policy that governments look at is not silo policy, but policy that will allow the integration of services that no matter which door you come through, you still come to the same house. That you can get service from the same place as opposed to you know, you come through a different door, you isolate into different rooms and the rooms don't open up to each other (VA Administrator 4).

A VA administrator mentioned that another aspect to the problem of revitalizing the DTES is that because it cannot be categorized with other populations in the rest of Canada, the challenge remains how to receive funding or resources for a very specific neighbourhood in British Columbia in an age of accountability in government:

A whole bunch of stuff because it is in the provincial side, in the Canada side, they say we can't look at policy from a very specific neighbourhood. We have to look at policies that are applicable to the whole region, the whole province, for the whole you know, country.

So we are trying to say, well okay, we understand that but maybe you can do it as a pilot project, you can do it as a demonstration, you can do something differently for the downtown eastside and they are willing to do that. You know putting it into the Olympic bid raised the level of awareness from government and then it actually help us because the belief is that because that actually got some international appreciation and attention and it got some extra points for Vancouver to win that bid, so now we have to deliver it (VA Administrator 4).

Such pilot programs are successful in leveraging resources, however she was quick to point out that such programs are only viable with long term government support behind it.

Both LGNOW and VANOC administrators also identified drug abuse, mental illness and the need for adequate access to quality health care as significant issues to address (LGNOW Administrator 1, 2, and 3, VANOC administrator). As with the case of housing and because of their organizational mandates, the administrator's acknowledged their organization's involvement is limited.

With respect to the social development initiative and the issues connected with it, the administrators responded similarly as they all viewed the social development initiative centered to revitalizing the DTES and the social issues within it as accessibility, homelessness and housing, health and economic revitalization. However the administrators also agreed that the Olympic Games would by no means be able to solve this initiative and a greater commitment over a longer period than 2010 would be needed. Understanding each organization's commitment, and organizational role in the VA is the subject of the second research question which was: How do VANOC and LGNOW see their role/interests in the VA and how does this compare with the VA's view of both their interests?

4.2 Roles and Interest

Additional interview questions were asked of administrators about their organizational roles, contributions to their inter-organizational relationships, and the organizational strategies

that have been or are currently being used to achieve mutual interests in the social development initiative.

4.2.1 Vancouver Agreement's Role

All VA administrators primarily identified the VA as a gateway to all three levels of government. The VA acts as a Urban Development Agreement through which government initiatives are combined with priorities to dismantle the drug scene (VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4), revitalize the Hastings Corridor (VA Administrator 4), increase safety and security (VA Administrator 1, 3 and 4) and address the housing issues in the DTES (VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4). All administrators also identified that through this, they have become increasingly knowledgeable that the issues and the community groups with whom they could work together with. Comparing the VA to LGNOW, the administrator commented that:

The VA is interesting, it's got all three levels of government so the part with 2010 Legacies Nowis, we partnered with the VA on various programs and we have the leverage we thought saw originally with the Vancouver Agreement to look like we are part of the Olympics but be a little bit separate which allows us not to focus on hardcore legacies like bricks and mortar but the softer side which is people and neighbourhoods. So the whole idea of LegaciesNow originally was to strengthen communities. So we look in our bylaws of our society, it talks about strengthening communities, talks about profiling aboriginals. So if you take the downtown eastside and you take the VA, you take 2010, they have a lot of aboriginal people, they have a disproportionate number of youth and seniors. So what we hoped is to try and make people understand that there is a broader community than the stereotype and we can do that mainly by encouraging Olympic sponsors to make funds available for social undertakings, support thirteen points that were in the bid book that were guaranteed., It's just to help foster and I guess to be a go between to make sure that those things happen (LGNOW Administrator 1).

All administrators in both LGNOW and VANOC shared similar views with respect to the VA as being a means to work with all three levels of government on the downtown eastside. They also identified the VA as an 'implementing agent' in addressing the ICI commitments of which it is the lead on the housing sectoral table. The LGNOW administrators specifically identified the VA as a potential funding partner in cooperative programs, which allows for greater shared financial

responsibility while easing the individual organizational burden to fund programs (LGNOW 2 and 3). The VANOC administrator identified the VA primarily as a means of addressing the ICI commitments, specifically around housing but also in terms of identifying procurement and employment opportunities (VANOC Administrator).

4.2.2 VANOC's Role

VANOC's identified role by all administrators in this study is to first organize and host the Olympic Games and second, to work towards fulfilling the ICI commitments. By working with LGNOW, it hopes to address both the Sport and Recreation and Arts and Culture related ICI commitments and with the VA to address the housing, procurement, and related economic ICI commitments (VANOC Administrator). The administrator also discussed that financial accountability and transparency, transportation, and accessibility related ICI commitments would be VANOC's responsibility (VANOC Administrator).

A third role identified by all administrators for VANOC was to provide its partners including both LGNOW and VA, access to its corporate sponsors. A VA administrator described this role in the following exchange:

Interviewer: So then what does VANOC return to the Vancouver Agreement?

VA Administrator: \$2 million dollars (laughing)...incredible connections. Potential in terms of new relationships in the corporate community. They delivery benefits agreements potentially on two sites which will drive jobs and procurement opportunity.

The Benefits Agreement referred to VANOC's stipulation with its major contracts, which include the Olympic village and venue constructions, to utilize a percentage of supplies, services and human resources directly from the DTES (VANOC Administrator, VA 3, and 4). The VANOC administrator noted that although the Benefits Agreement has not been formalized

within each specific contract, it will be in the near future and it directly relates to ICI economic and employment commitments (VANOC Administrator).

LGNOW administrators also agreed that access to corporate sponsors as an important component of their relationship with VANOC (LGNOW Administrator 1, 2, and 3). A LGNOW administrator explained that as an organization, although it has freedom of choice with respect to funding partners, it must still respect VANOC's sponsorship agreements and therefore cannot work with a competing sponsor within a given industry, such as in telecommunications (LGNOW Administrator 3). As a result, it must actively work with VANOC to ensure that appropriate sponsors are considered for 2010 Legacies Now Society's own organization's programs and initiatives.

4.2.3 2010 Legacies Now Society's Role

Built around its "Now" initiatives (Sport and Recreation Now, Arts, Literacy, and Volunteerism), LGNOW administrators identified its organizational mandate as a not for profit organization focused on identifying potential pre and post Olympic related province wide initiatives in areas of youth, women, aboriginals, and multiculturalism. All three administrators identified addressing this mandate through capacity building with both public sector and private sector partners which include Olympic sponsors (LGNOW Administrator 1, 2, and 3). The administrators stated that organizationally, its relative smaller size allows it to be more nimble and entrepreneurial to act as a vehicle to more effectively leverage the 2010 opportunity (LGNOW Administrator 2). Although the organization's funding is more limited and strategic, which often means the 2010 Legacies Now Society will not entirely fund a program, it can work with its many partners to leverage its seed funding to garner more support from other potential

funding opportunities (LGNOW Administrator 3). Such partnerships best exemplify 2010

Legacies Now Society:

Concept, development and discussion – we want to get potential partners involved there and development and ideas and committing resources together so it's shared and then pilot it, launching it, testing it, rolling it out wherever that might be. It might be one city only, it might be provincially, it might be whatever and then ongoing evaluations and then enhancements or do we pass it off with this? This project may be owned or initiated and to a partner, turn it over to an organization saying you are now the best to carry this on. We've taken this as far as we can and now it makes sense to work there (LGNOW Administrator 2).

Examples of such partnerships include LGNOW's "Now" initiatives. Within its Sports and RecNow, LGNOW has partnered across the province to host its Spirit of 2010 Hockey tournament which included 90,000 youth hockey players in over 90 province wide communities. Under ArtsNow, \$2.1 million in 195 projects in 54 communities province-wide was used to increase capacity in art initiatives. Its LiteracyNow initiative has over 100 organizations involved in creating 44 pilots around the province to address the growing illiteracy rates in the province. And under Volunteerism, 2010 Legacies Now Society launched VolWeb -a province wide online volunteer network hosting over 1100 volunteers in 200 event organizations (2010 Legacies Now Society, 2006).

With respect to the social development initiative, all three LGNOW administrators discussed that its involvement is predicated on its organizational value of inclusion in all of its programming. While the DTES may, in some instances, have its own inclusion strategy in relation to given Now initiatives, the VA and VANOC do not – they are only considered partners in those strategies. In the case of the DTES, its involvement is in two areas: working with the VA on programs in youth and women and working with the VA and VANOC as an implementing agent towards addressing the ICI commitments. They also noted that the primary means of fulfilling the ICI commitments is through the sectoral tables, of which, 2010 Legacies Now

Society will chair the Sports and Recreation and Arts and Culture (LGNOW Administrator 1, 2, and 3). Both the Vancouver Agreement and VANOC administrators viewed 2010 Legacies Now Society similarly as having a province wide mandate to identify strategies through its Now initiatives, but they also specifically identified LGNOW as an “implementing agent” in addressing the ICI statements (VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4, VANOC Administrator).

4.2.4 Strategies

The most significant inter organizational strategies identified by administrators either related specifically to their organization’s goals which either coincided between the organizations or with the ICI commitments.

4.2.4.1 Non ICI Commitment Related Inter Organizational Strategies

The most important non-ICI commitment related strategy was between LGNOW and the VA and their Accessible and Inclusive Cities Initiative. The Accessible and Inclusive Cities program was described by a VA administrator as a measuring tool to evaluate the integration of people with disabilities throughout the province (VA Administrator 3). A second VA administrator alluded to the fact that because Mayor Sam Sullivan, the current mayor of Vancouver, has a physical disability, Vancouver will be working even harder to make the city as accessible and inclusive as possible (VA Administrator 2). Areas in which accessibility and inclusivity could be enhanced include identifying the level to which restaurants accommodate people with physical disabilities via specific services such as having adapted washroom facilities, providing handicap parking, having accessible entrances/exits and areas of refuge (VA Administrator 4). In terms of safety, this administrator also identified municipal strategies such as enhancing crosswalks and even modifying telephone booths for people with visual disabilities (VA Administrator 4).

4.2.4.2 ICI Commitments Related to Inter Organizational Goals

The most significant ICI related inter organizational strategies included the involvement of all three organizations but also strategies specifically between the VA and VANOC related to social housing, economic and employment related ICI Commitments.

The social housing ICI commitment in the bid book included a stipulation to devote between 200 – 250 units for social housing in the False Creek Olympic Village. The then new Mayor Larry Campbell and his municipal government changed the percentages to be roughly a third market housing, a third middle class housing and the final third for low income social housing resulting in around 300 units of social housing (VA Administrator 2, 3 and 4). The Sullivan's municipal government then reverted back to the ICI commitment for 250 units of social housing. Although the debate to change the percentages and overall units of social housing continue, the social housing legacy of the False Creek Olympic Village has been regarded by all administrators within both organizations as a significant ICI commitment related inter-organizational strategy to address the growing social housing concern in the DTES, where a significant proportion of the social housing stock exists.

The second and third ICI Commitments related inter-organizational strategy identified by the VA and VANOC surrounds potential economic and employment development. As previously mentioned, these benefits would predominately result from the Benefits Agreement, Procurement Strategy and Opportunities for "2010 by 2010" Strategy (VANOC Administrator, VA Administrator 1, 3, and 4).

When asked to comment on the potential success of the strategies, the VANOC administrator was optimistic that the Benefits Agreement would act as a catalyst to enhance economic revitalization efforts, but restated VANOC's position of 250 units of social housing and the debate around the Olympic Village:

Our ICI was a commitment to 250 units of social housing units and that was our commitment, the rest was simply a commitment or philosophy of the city and that's still a city project and the city has the opportunity to add to that" (VANOC administrator).

VA administrators shared similar optimism for the potential of the Benefits Agreement as part of the VA's economic revitalization strategy which aims to encourage economic redevelopment and employment opportunities without displacement in the DTES (VA Administrators 3, and 4) . The key, they contended, would be to leverage the Olympics around brand awareness and business development in areas of employment and corporate engagement with VANOC's tier 1, 2 and 3 level sponsors (VA Administrator 3, VA Administrator 4). Although administrators did not take a specific position on social housing, they did reiterate that improving social housing includes a commitment from both the provincial and the federal government which is currently not meeting the demand. (VA Administrator 2, 3, and 4).

Probably the strongest inter-organizational strategy is the CHILL program; a three way inter-organizational strategy involving 2010 Legacies Now Society, VANOC, and the VA. The CHILL program takes 125 children and youth from the DTES, who would not otherwise have the opportunity, and provides them with the necessary resources to go to a local mountain and learn to snowboard. 2010 Legacies Now Society provides funding for the program, VANOC provides corporate engagement which has resulted in BELL sponsoring the program, and the VA works with the community to identify the children to get involved. The success of the program has received acclaim on the IOC website (LGNOW Administrator 3). Along with addressing ICI commitments in sport and recreation, and organizational goals, a VA Administrator discussed how the program demonstrates program sustainability because in its inception, the program did not include a long-term strategy. However, by now identifying an existing community program called ZERO CEILING, designed to take youth from the DTES to Whistler to become snowboard instructors, CHILL now provides its graduating youth with options after they finish

from the program (VA Administrator 4). A sentiment shared by a LGNOW Administrator was that:

CHILL was a program that didn't exist here so we were able to take that but then by knowing another program did exist – ZERO CEILING, where they took inner city youth and took them out to Whistler and they got training to become a snowboard instructor and then Whistler Blackcomb hires them. Yeah, so we fund that and they have some other funders so. Know we are linking CHILL into that so that kids who go through CHILL and learn to snowboard its not like okay that was great for a winter and now what? Well now some of these kids have the opportunity to apply for ZERO CEILING and become a snowboard instructor so making those links to sustain programs if we can (LGNOW Administrator 3).

CHILL was used as an example by all administrators to demonstrate the potential for what the three organizations can accomplish by working together: a program that includes corporate Olympic sponsorship, media exposure and program sustainability.

In summary, each organization's role with respect to the social development initiative was viewed by its administrators and the administrators in other two organizations based on the organizational mandate. The VA was primarily viewed as a government initiative working in the DTES to provide access to government and by the DTES community. VANOC's mandate was viewed as being primarily responsible for planning and hosting the Olympic Games while fulfilling the ICICS statements promised during the bid. Its role within the social development initiative was to fulfill this mandate while providing both the VA and LGNOW access to its corporate sponsors for potential sponsorship opportunities. 2010 Legacies Now Society was primarily viewed as the community arm to the Olympic Games with a province wide mandate for its Now initiatives with community groups. With this, all organizations viewed its role to continue such engagement particularly to the DTES.

An example of the potential such stakeholder relationships can return to the social development initiative was determined to be the CHILL program which includes all three organizations, as well as corporate engagement resulting in it gaining exposure with the media and the IOC. Between all three organizations, it is important to understand what factors both facilitate and constrain such inter-organizational collaborations, which is the focus of the third research question which was What factors are facilitating or constraining the sustainability of the relationship between the VA, VANOC and LGNOW?

4.3 Factors Facilitating Relationship Sustainability

The administrators were asked to identify factors they believe have facilitated or constrained the sustainability of the inter-organizational relationships up to the time of this study. Factors found to facilitate the relationship's sustainability include: the unique organizational dynamic's with respect to Vancouver hosting the Olympic Games, each organization's commitment to chair and participate in the sectoral tables focused on developing recommendations to fulfill the ICICS, and working with key individuals who together have significant control over VANOC's Board of Directors. Factors found to constrain the relationship's sustainability include: managing expectations within the community, governmental politics, and addressing inter-organizational differences.

4.3.1.1 Inter-Organizational Dynamics

When describing their own and each other's unique organizational dynamics, three themes emerged as helping to facilitate the organizational relationships between LGNOW, VANOC and the VA. Beginning with a shared commitment and passion to meet the ICI statements outlined in the bid book, the lack of organizational turnover, and the added value of a

network created between the three organizations were determined as factors facilitating their working relationships.

A LGNOW Administrator commented on how during the bid phase, a group within the Bid Corp's Board of Directors made it their goal from day one to use the Olympic Games as an opportunity to examine and address the social issues affecting the DTES. This social agenda, which transformed into the ICI commitments, embedded a commitment of social responsibility to improve the long term well being of the DTES community and its residents. With the federal, provincial, municipal governments along with VANOC signing off on the ICI commitments, it cemented their promise until to 2010 to reach the goals outlined in the ICI statements (LGNOW Administrator 1). Although the decade-long commitment is not over, it is all the more impressive when one understands that, except for one VA administrator who later returned to the VA, and one VANOC administrator who began in October 2005, all have remained in their posts as far back as 1998, when the bid was still in preliminary discussions (City of Vancouver, 2006). Interviewees identified their personal passion to remaining committed as a considerable factor to reducing organizational turnover and ensuring the work remained on schedule (LGNOW Administrator 3, VA Administrator 2, 3, and 4). The lack of turnover is significant because the time to hire new staff and to update them on developments as a result has been minimized.

The long standing relationships that have been cultivated have also been attributed to the perceived strength of their organizational relationships, particularly between LGNOW and the VA. Both discussed how sharing office space during each other's organizational infancy created a strong relationship:

I don't think that was ever, I mean for me, that was never – we are going to work with the VA on this, this or this....It was just that we worked together. If that's with a project of I'll hop in to meet with the VA one day and they'll say – oh we got this really great project maybe that's something we could work together on. Well then their ADM became

our COO and now he's our strategic advisor. He still sits on one of the boards of the VA and then our new COO has always been involved with the VA (LGNOW Administrator 3).

Both LGNOW and VA administrators continued to discuss how these long standing relationships have created a supportive and honest working relationship (2010 Legacies Now Society 1, 2, and 3; VA Administrator 3, and 4). A second LGNOW administrator discussed that such a relationship is essential in order to overcome challenges and effectively work together:

The challenges early on in the planning and discussion were what are the priorities? People have different things that been a priority to them so if you are going to understand if I do this, this and this, I'm going to get to your priority. If I don't do this, I am never going to get to this priority. So it's having that honest discussion. You have to work through that and say how are we going to get that to happen? And we want to get to all the priorities, but if we all do these two and we know are going to have a challenge getting to your third thing, we found that's really important to you, but unless we deal with these two, we aren't going to get to that (LGNOW Administrator 2).

VA administrators also reiterated how the long standing relationships built on respect and honesty have been essential to working together, even within their own organization:

It's all about building that trust, it's about building that common vision. It's also about respect for those of us who were involved during the bid phase and what an incredible accomplishment. I mean I have nothing but respect for people like [name deleted] who took a risk to sign on behalf of the province. I worked with [name deleted] as an absolute unknown. We didn't know each other very well and she become one of my closest colleagues. I mean this was changing the way people think about the Olympics, changing the way we do business and it's incredible. It's transformative and what I have personally is a commitment to build those trust with certain individuals within VANOC, offering my suggestions, looking within myself for what I do and what I need to change in order to make it successful – because this is bigger than any of us (VA Administrator 3).

All the administrators specifically viewed the ICI statements as essential to bringing stakeholders together because it crosses over very well with each organization's goal to revitalize the DTES (LGNOW Administrator 3, VANOC Administrator , VA Administrator 1, and 3). Administrators also agreed that although each organization shares a common vision for what

they would like to see become of the DTES, each organization arrives at that vision from very different mandates (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 2, VA Administrator 1,3, and 4).

Administrators discussed that with each organization's uniqueness comes the ability to share knowledge and ideas, create better programs and policies (LGNOW Administrator 2, VA Administrator 3), bring people to the table, and develop stronger partnerships (LGNOW Administrator 1, 2, and 3, VANOC Administrator , VA Administrator 4). This in turn can enhance organizational legitimacy and lead to secure funding easier (LGNOW Administrator 2, VA Administrator 4). All administrators concluded the greatest benefit of this opportunity to work together is to leverage the Olympics as means of increasing social awareness in Hallmark events (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 2, VA Administrator 1, 2, and 4), acting as a catalyst to accelerate social programs, policies and awareness (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 2, VANOC Administrator , VA Administrator 3) and creating long term social legacies (LGNOW Administrator 2, VA Administrator 2 and 3). Leveraging the Olympics was regarded by all the administrators as very important first step if sustained long term were to occur.

All administrators were adamant about addressing two very significant points with respect to sustainability. The first was that 2010 is merely a date and that although organizational strategic planning can include the Olympics, organizations must continue to plan well beyond it. The second was that the Olympics cannot be expected to address all the social issues affecting the downtown eastside. Therefore, it is important to use the Olympics as a means, not as an end, to address the social issues affecting the downtown eastside, even though it cannot be expected that the area will be completely revitalized by 2011.

4.3.1.2 Sectoral tables

A second factor identified as facilitating the sustainability of the three organizations' working relationship were the sectoral tables. Although they are still in the planning stages, administrators identified them as instrumental in providing recommendations to government and changing social policy.

The sectoral tables are designed to involve the necessary stakeholders from public and private sectors to address the 14 areas and 37 commitments outlined in the bid book in areas including housing, sports and recreation, arts and culture, and accessibility. These stakeholders together form the "ICI Workgroup" and provide recommendations to the "ICI Steering Committee" - which consists of a smaller group of key decision makers who are ultimately responsible for implementing the recommendations (LGNOW Administrator 3).

A VA administrator claimed the greatest impact will come from these sectoral tables because they are the means of implementing the ICICS (VA Administrator 4). She explained that the government would be the most significant player because it is in the best position to change policy. A second VA administrator indicated that although all three levels of government have not officially signed off on implementing all the recommendations from the sectoral tables, they have verbally provided their intent to do so (VA Administrator 1).

The sectoral tables are also designed to be hosted by those considered experts within the various areas of the ICI statements. Because of its involvement in sport and art, and its "Now" initiatives, the 2010 Legacies Now Society was viewed by all administrators as the logical choice to chair the Sports and Recreation and the Arts and Culture sectoral tables. The Vancouver Agreement, based on their expertise on the social issues surrounding the downtown eastside, has signed off on chairing the housing sectoral table. VANOC will be chairing the sectoral table surrounding accessibility. This expertise from varying backgrounds gives the sectoral table an

incredible advantage in developing recommendations that not only address the key issues but provide a realistic approach towards funding and time required to make these recommendations more achievable and sustainable. When asked if the sectoral tables are a clear benefit, the VANOC administrator simply responded “absolutely” (VANOC Administrator).

4.3.1.3 VANOC Board of Directors

The third significant factor facilitating the inter-organizational relationships that was mentioned by all administrators is the structure of VANOC’s Board of Directors. It consists of 20 individuals: three appointed by the federal government, three by the provincial government, two appointed by the City of Vancouver, two by the municipality of Whistler, one by the First Nations Host, seven by the Canadian Olympic Committee, one by the Canadian Paralympic Committee, and one determined by the other 19 members (VANOC, 2006). A LGNOW administrator said that the support of the Board of Directors towards ICI initiatives has been a significant benefit as revealed in the following exchange:

Administrator: During the bid phase we had myself and [VANOC Board of Director] who were on the board of the bid and that’s where you got the goals to make sure that VANOC included the goals of the city and the provincial government.

Interviewer: My first thought was that it would have been kind of a weird relationship...but the way you are describing it...

Administrator: The main strength...And that’s what makes you know, your sitting in the VANOC board meeting, I’m not there and have someone say well we don’t want to do that with this drug infested area. You have someone very knowledgeable...[who are] key people so now then it’s a government’s policy...so you have this push against resistance to making sure, it’s the key to whole part.

Interviewer: How do you balance between what the government has identified as important and prioritized and what other stakeholders at the board would want?

Administrator: Its interesting because its not really a push challenge cause its been embedded from day one, is one of the reasons we are having the Olympics, to improve the long-term community standards in Vancouver and everybody signed on this is what we are going to undertake and then the [VANOC] board reviewed it and took over the assumption from the bid. So the board is pretty good in general (LGNOW Administrator I).

A VA administrator agreed with the board's positive position to use the Olympic Games for social development, which she attributed to the individuals' on the board's long standing history with social development in the DTES (VA Administrator 4). However, one VA administrator disagreed and suggested that although VANOC adopted the ICI statements for the bid book, certain Board of Director members may not necessarily be familiar with them, which creates a challenge in adhering to the commitments. She explained:

I have a different perspective...I absolutely have a different perspective that many of the stakeholders on the VANOC Board of Directors probably are not familiar with the inner city inclusive commitments, they may be not but during the bid phase, we fought long and hard...with the bid's leadership to recognize this is a) a vulnerable place for the bid being successful in Vancouver, and b) people taking up the mantle. What's happened, which is just incredible, is that VANOC has included sustainability in their values system and that was there from the beginning, but where did the inner city inclusive fit? We had manager's support but it took, I believe its been driven by the success of getting into the guarantee section of the bid book and by having people come on tours of the downtown eastside since the commitments were signed to really see the value added and see the Olympics as an opportunity for transformation within the downtown eastside as one additional tool in our toolkit to transform the downtown eastside (VA Administrator 3).

This administrator also mentioned that the Board of Directors is where decisions are made and that this case is no different from the board consisting of the three of the four signatories (federal, provincial, municipal) government, except that VANOC is the fourth signatory. The three levels of government are considered signatories because of their financial assistance, for which VANOC is responsible for (LGNOW Administrator 1, VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4). In regards to the impact VANOC's Board of Directors has had on the sustainability of the inter-organizational relationships, having the support from the very top decision makers has not only made the priorities clear but has also minimized organizational conflicts between what those priorities are and the directions that should be taken.

A second VA administrator discussed why it is important for VANOC's Board of Directors to continue the social agenda developed by the Board of Directors of the Bid Corporation. She explained how during the bid phase, the help of key senior decision makers, including some from the Bid Corporation's Board of Directors, to "shuttle diplomacy" with the community proved to be significant, which culminated in the creation and adoption of the ICI statements. She said that this board must continue to demonstrate such cooperation with the community and work around the ICICS especially since it was a promise made during the bid phase, and that this responsibility ultimately lies with the signatories (VA Administrator 3).

4.3.2 Factors Constraining Relationship Sustainability

Factors found to be constraining the sustainability/viability of the inter-organizational relationships included: managing a working relationship with the community, the politics of government, and inter-organizational challenges.

4.3.2.1 Managing a Working Community Relationship

All interviewees discussed how working with the community has allowed them to better identify the social issues that need to be addressed, along with providing a mechanism for further cooperation and consultation. However, they also identified this as the greatest constraining factor affecting their relationship because of a lack of realistic expectations as to what can and cannot be accomplished during these Olympic Games. The key questions relating back to the bid phase and now with the sectoral tables are: who are the key community members, who should be involved in the community consultation process, and what constitutes appropriate community representation (VA Administrator 1, and 2). Once community groups have been identified, they experience barriers to participation including transportation and daycare (VANOC Administrator), finding a mutual time to bring everyone together (VA Administrator 3), and

developing consensus (VANOC Administrator). Finally, if consensus can be achieved, identifying what is realistic with respect to the ICI statements is a challenge faced by all interviewees, as indicated in the following statement.

The art of all this is will be it's a place marker only, those commitments. The art is what will happen over those four years of how we will implement those commitments in terms of incorporating appropriate goal statements, appropriate action plans and performance measures...that we can find some sort of common ground between community, residents, business, three levels of government, VANOC and the implementing partners. The art will be finding that common ground because there is that real gap between what community activists were asking for during the bid phase and governments know what we can deliver and one example is its very unlikely, if an action, if a goal statement is developed 2010 units of housing. That is very unlikely able to happen and we may not, we will not be able to deliver on that without the federal dollars for housing. So I think the art of this is in identifying realistic action plans and goal statements that really really can be delivered. Otherwise there is going to be a gap between the different segments that we need to bring together to make the inclusive Olympics real (VA Administrator 3).

This challenge, as a VA administrator described it, involves a component of risk:

Well there's huge risks that they won't be fulfilled. I mean in the housing area for example there are commitments that would take hundreds of millions of dollars and to build a whole bunch of new housing, that is not going to be possible between now and even if the money was there, between now and 2010. There's no federal program, maybe after yesterday, but no federal provincial programs that will cover that. So there are risks so what we need to do is to work with the community to manage expectations as well as and see how we can best meet, come towards close to meeting those commitments and it may be over a longer period of time (VA Administrator 1).

To address this growing concern, interviewees outlined three key steps. The first step requires establishing a communication strategy to accompany the community consultation process (LGNOW Administrator 2, VA Administrator 1, 2, and 3). The second step would look to identify what the community continues to sees as important (VANOC Administrator) and then working towards realistic, yet not too comfortable goals (LGNOW Administrator 1). The third step involves highlighting successes to demonstrate to the community that the ICI statements are in fact achievable (VA Administrator 1, LGNOW Administrator 2).

In the end, the goal of such a public engagement strategy is to develop a balance between each group and manage expectations, something a VA administrator referred to as “variable performance”:

I think we need to be upfront and honest. Honest right from the beginning. Have you met [VANOC Administrator]? She said there will be variable performance and some areas will over achieve and some areas will under achieve and so how we manage that and how we communicate about that is really important (VA Administrator 1).

4.3.2.2 Governmental Politics

Governmental politics was identified as a second constraining factor to the inter-organizational’s relationship sustainability. Although both VANOC and 2010 Legacies Now Society discussed broad governmental challenges, VA administrators, with their significant exposure working with government officials, provided the most detail surrounding the challenges. A lack of governmental funding for social programs beginning in the 90’s, when the federal government began cutting back funding for social housing up until it was entirely eliminated in 1993 was cited an instrumental factor in the current housing crisis in the DTES (Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation, 2002). The provincial government has continued its funding for social housing, but VA administrators mentioned that this federal policy shift has left Vancouver’s social housing stock at an all time low and in poor condition (VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4). The administrators recommended that the first and foremost governmental action needs to be reinvesting in social programs, including social housing, healthcare, addiction support, and welfare because funding has remained stagnant for the past 15 years (VANOC Administrator , VA Administrator 1, 2, 3, and 4).

A second challenge focused on the impact of governmental structure on decision making because government turnover, whether because of elections or ministerial changes, has

accounted for significant and often exasperated lobbying to ensure ongoing government support (VA Administrator 2, and 4):

Provincial government has the most changes – I am sure that we went through 5 or 6 of their ADM's...because in those times...like when the Vancouver Agreement was started there were three deputy ministers even with the same minister...the deputy is always changing (VA Administrator 4).

The third governmental challenge identified, included working within federal, provincial and municipal governments, is that governments and ministers are very compartmentalized, which results in individual decision making processes and different organizational cultures. Although these need to be respected, they result in very slow decision making as the following exchange demonstrates:

VA Administrator 2: Yeah it's a challenge. I think just on the VA, you know three levels of government we all have our different ways of making decisions, we all have our own culture about how we work together, how hierarchical and non hierarchical we are so the way you overcome all those things is just by talking and by chewing things over back and forth. That's the difficulty with the Vancouver Agreement is that it takes a lot of talk to understand each other's different cultures, understand how you can work with each other in a way that allows each level of government to move initiatives forward through their decision making process.

Interviewer: Does that happen timely or have you noticed that it's a very very long long time?

VA Administrator 2: It's painful.

She explained that the solution is to identify the key decision makers and either work your way up the organizational chain through people who believe in what you are trying to accomplish, or else by going straight to the top and hoping you will be heard. These organizational dynamics touch on a second challenge with government's responsibility: being accountable to the greatest number of people. The result is a "cookie cutter" strategy of implementing the same program in different regions. However, this may not work in the DTES as it has a unique population. Described by administrators as "the poorest postal code in Canada", they are not receiving

enough government support to adequately address the social issues, which remains an ongoing challenge (VA Administrator 2, and 4).

Administrators, however, were also quick to point out some of the positive benefits of working with government including the ongoing support of the City of Vancouver (VA Administrator 4), the provincial government's commitment to continuing to provide social housing funding even when the federal government had cut their support (VA Administrator 1, 2, and 4), and the federal government's support for the Vancouver Agreement (LGNOW Administrator 1).

4.3.2.3 Inter Organizational Challenges

A 2010 Legacies Now Society member first pointed out that the inter-organizational challenges involved are the same as in any other relationship. The only difference here is this relationship started in 1999 and won't end until after the Games are hosted in 2010:

So the fact is that you started in 1999 but the end of this project is 2010. So you couldn't have somebody say, oh well so this is our flavor of the month now, this is the flavor of the month now. You're stuck with it. Once you won the Olympics, you're stuck with it til 2010. So government quite often goes for 2 years or maybe someone comes in changes or goes. You can't – this has to til 2010 so you had a guarantee of 6 to 7 years of working towards your project (LGNOW Administrator 1).

Another challenge identified by interviewees revolved around the importance of respecting inter-organizational differences around their mandates and jurisdictions on issues (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 2, VA Administrator 1, 3, and 4). With respect to organizational jurisdiction, a LGNOW Administrator identified a potential challenge would be if the other organization's attempted to offload its accountability onto 2010 Legacies Now Society when it is not in position to adequately addressing it (LGNOW Administrator 1). One VA administrator identified VANOC potentially losing focus of its social agenda as another potential concern,

while recognizing that VANOC is not the only organization responsible for addressing the ICI statements:

The ICI commitment is not strictly VANOC, the ICI is for all three governments and VANOC has signed off on it and so VANOC is one of the signatories on it so when you look at when they were created, all of the different partners identified the areas that they would take the lead role on, that's something that happened before the bid. What we've done is that we've fine tuned who the individuals were as far as taking that particular lead so you keep on asking the question of VANOC and the ICI. But we are part of the ICI umbrella, we are not the umbrella (VANOC Administrator 1).

A second challenge identified revolved around funding. Both 2010 Legacies Now Society and VANOC administrators pointed out that funding is limited or else non-existent, therefore community expectations would be tied to this and potential issues surrounding this would need to be discussed (LGNOW Administrator 2, LGNOW Administrator 3, VANOC Administrator). The VA administrator suggested that because of the public promises, along with the government's financial commitment, VANOC is ultimately accountable to fulfilling its obligations around hosting the games including financial and social practices. She also said that, in conjunction to rising operating costs, addressing the commitments is becoming a growing concern (VA Administrator 4). The VANOC administrator admitted that the financial expectations from the community with respect to seed or program funding are simply not there, but that whatever funding has been allocated to fulfilling the ICI commitments has remained intact. The administrator commented that the key will be to wait until after the sectoral tables have been completed and then strategically invest in various programs projects (VANOC Administrator). But as previously stated the administrator wished to reiterate the responsibility of funding and costs towards hosting the Games is to be shared between all the signatories, a sentiment that was shared by a VA administrator:

Well I think we've got a budget challenge now whether its VANOC's budget challenge or ours collectively, I'd say more there's a budget challenge in implementing the ICI commitments for us all (VA Administrator 2).

The VANOC administrator also pointed to the lack of “core funding” as a growing concern:

VANOC Administrator: The other challenge that we are starting to cross right now is how do you provide secure funding for structure that needs to be there in order for programs to be implemented.

Interviewer: Such as?

VANOC Administrator: Core funding, because historically most organizations, most governments fund program.,No one to some degree funds core structure now that is one of the things that we need to look at how we support core, what it is going to look like 6 months from now? I don't know but it's there and therefore it's one of the issues that has been identified. So that's the other side from a dollar perspective (VANOC Administrator).

The key to addressing this financial challenge, as agreed to by LGNOW and VANOC administrators, is to use the limited funding to strategically tap into existing funding opportunities in order to leverage more funding (LGNOW Administrator 2 and 3, VANOC Administrator). A VA administrator commented that in the beginning, the VA was on the opposite end because it did not have start up funding. This resulted in external organizations being less likely to support its programs and policies. But after the federal and provincial governments each contributed \$10 million to the VA (Vancouver Agreement, 2006), it was now in position to both provide start up funding for projects and leverage for additional funding from organizations, such as 2010 Legacies Now Society (VA Administrator 4). She commented that although VANOC's financial challenges meant it could not provide direct financial support the VA, the hope was to have both VANOC and the VA work together to leverage the Olympic Games for corporate support for social development initiatives (VA Administrator 4).

A third challenge was how to adequately measure the social return of investment (SROI) (VA Administrator 1 and 3, VANOC Administrator). While working towards creating positive social change within the DTES is a challenge in itself, evaluating the effectiveness of the processes which can not necessarily be expressed quantitatively will also need to be addressed.

This challenge not only includes developing appropriate social indicators, but also evaluating if the social indicators are measuring what is needed (VANOC Administrator). The administrator hoped that each sectoral table would be in better position to address these growing concerns. The VA administrators were also worried about measuring the social return on investment, but hoped that the current population and health indicators it uses can be improved or enhanced to adequately measure social impact in the DTES (VA Administrator 1, and 3).

In summary, the factors found to constrain the stakeholder relationships included balancing expectations internally and within the community, working with the realities of government, and ensuring that organizational differences in mandates were respected. Although these constraining factors were acknowledged by all administrators interviewed, their hope was to utilize and harness their strengths including each organization's uniqueness, the individual passion and organizational commitment to the social development of the DTES and the support of key VANOC Board of Director's commitment to fulfilling the ICI statements.

Understanding such factors was found to be significant especially when one considers that these inter-organizational relationships must continue until 2010 regardless of whether the organizations wish to disengage, which was unlikely at the time of this study. Therefore it would also seem important to understand where each organization positions itself and desired outcomes as 2010 approaches. Such is the focus of the final research question which was: What outcomes did LGNOW, VA, and VAOC hope to accomplish in the VA and how will these be assessed?

4.4 Outcomes

When asked what each organization hoped to accomplish in the long term, each organization responded similarly about using the Olympic Games as a catalyst to accelerate the social agenda to revitalize the DTES which requires engaging in capacity building.

4.4.1 Vancouver Agreement Outcomes

VA administrators saw its sponsorship agreement with BELL as an example of what LGNOW administrators also hoped will continue in terms of corporate sponsorship opportunities with VANOC (Vancouver Agreement, 2005). VA administrators mentioned their desired goals include continuing to engage such sponsors in the downtown eastside as part of its economic revitalization strategy (VA Administrator 1, 3, and 4), work with VANOC around potential social housing opportunities (VA Administrator 1, and 2) and provide economic/employment/procurement opportunities (VA Administrator 1, 3, and 4). All VA administrators discussed that the ICI commitments, which bind VANOC and the 2010 Legacies Now Society so closely to the VA are only until 2010, when the games are hosted. Therefore it is important to use this opportunity to raise social awareness in hallmark events such as the Olympics (VA Administrator 3, and 4), change governmental policy around the social issues (VA Administrator 4), and use the Olympics to bring enhanced exposure to the social issues of the DTES:

Well with VANOC we are hoping that they can actually help facilitate some corporate sponsorship and about a year and a half ago, they did bring BELL and that's the \$2 million dollars for the downtown eastside for some economic initiatives so that's good. We are hoping that it will be a continuation of that kind of sponsorship and also by having VANOC there maybe you know, some of the folks will look at it in a more mainstream way – the downtown eastside issues rather than marginalizing it and we are hoping that through the Olympics, they will all be seen jumping on the bandwagon and they will actually invest economically in the downtown eastside (VA Administrator 4).

4.4.2 VANOC Outcomes

VANOC also reiterated both LGNOW and VA administrators' sentiments about using the Olympics as a catalyst to raise social awareness but also pointed to its primary focus:

We still have our primary focus which are the Games, ensuring the Games go on, ensure there is a cultural event and ensure the sustainability within that and therefore we look back at what were the commitments that were made and that's still our primary focus (VANOC Administrator).

With respect to the planning and hosting, the VANOC administrator only offered long term goals to focus on continuing to work with the necessary partners - on its housing and procurement strategies, and LGNOW around its sports and recreation and cultural legacies (VANOC Administrator).

But with respect to the long term goals surrounding fulfilling the ICI commitments, the administrator restated VANOC's position that it alone is not responsible for fulfilling the ICI commitments and it will work with its signatories and implementing partners to work to ensure that the legacies last beyond 2010:

Part of [VANOC's] role is building on what's in the community, we aren't there to create anything brand new again but building on what's in the community so that they keep on building capacity as part of this ongoing process that we are all working towards (VANOC Administrator).

4.4.3 2010 Legacies Now Society Outcomes

All interviewees responded that, it was important to continue to build capacity within the community specific to their Now initiatives and their overall inclusion strategy (LGNOW Administrator 2, and 3). Administrators identified continuing to work with the VA's network within the DTES in initiatives that have joint interests (LGNOW Administrator 3), the three levels of government (2010 Legacies Now Society 1) and with VANOC's sponsors as long term inter-organizational goals (LGNOW Administrator 1, 2, and 3). Administrators from 2010 Legacies Now Society reiterated that although the Olympics have brought with it the opportunity to act as a catalyst to accelerate programs that would have otherwise taken longer to address, it is only a date. The focus now should shift to identify strategic goals beyond 2010 and up until even 2020 (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 2).

4.4.4 Evaluation

Although each organization identified their own organizational goals regarding their inter-organizational relationships and that evaluation of such goals resided with the respective organization, and with respect to the SDI, an evaluation framework is still to be determined. When asked to comment on specific measurement and evaluation of the goals relating to the SDI, each organization identified that either each organization's independent evaluation frameworks could be used, a community group called the Impact on Communities Coalition would be responsible, or else the individual sectoral tables would be responsible for developing its own evaluation framework.

Administrators from 2010 Legacies Now Society indicated that their own qualitative based evaluation frameworks would be developed. Compared to quantitative methods, these frameworks are preferred because they are able to more accurately describe the social impact of the programs (LGNOW Administrator 2). The administrator continued that with respect to its sport and recreation sectoral table that its organization is responsible for chairing, developing indicators reflecting that uniqueness of the DTES will need to be created through the sectoral table (LGNOW Administrator 2). The two other administrators discussed that the responsibility would be given to the Impact on Communities Coalition but that specifics were still to be determined (LGNOW Administrator 1, and 3),

VA Administrators all mentioned that its current internal evaluation framework being used on the DTES would be the one to be used on the inter-organizational initiatives (VA Administrator 1, 2, and 3). The framework includes approximately 20 population health indicators in areas of housing, business, and employment and constantly monitors what is occurring in the community (VA Administrator 1, 2, and 3). An administrator also mentioned the possibility of the Impact on Communities Coalition being responsible for developing

indicators, but that was still to be determined (VA Administrator 1). She commented that with respect to the ICI commitments, VANOC would be responsible for developing the indicators. This viewpoint was in stark contrast to second VA administrator who stated the sectoral tables would be responsible for creating its own evaluation criteria (VA Administrator 3).

VANOC identified the broadness of the ICI commitment statements and their interpretation would be a potential issue and therefore establishing an appropriate evaluation framework could also be challenging (VANOC Administrator). The administrator commented that the interpretations of the commitments would need to identify the social gaps and means to addressing such gaps as they exist in the DTES. These social gaps bring along with them the issue as to how to appropriately measure the social impact of the strategies, a sentiment shared by a VA administrator (VA Administrator 3).

4.4.5 Timeframe

With respect to how administrators saw their organizations as 2010 approaches, LGNOW administrators responded that organizationally its focus is on its “2020 vision” strategic plan (2010 Legacies Now Society 1, 2 and 3)

After 2010, you’ve got to do your planning for after 2010 starting 2008, 2009 at the latest, I mean its starting now but you have to do your planning now (LGNOW Administrator 1).

VA Administrators shared the same viewpoint that from an organizational perspective, their timelines go beyond 2010 (VA Administrator 1, 2, and 3).

I think its wrong to set a date of 2010. I think we do need to cast to 2020. Long term change in a community as devastated as the downtown eastside, as I said, folks have said anecdotally 20, you know 30 years to make change so the Olympics may help us get there sooner than if they hadn’t come to town but they are simply a tool. They are a means to help us get to our end (VA Administrator 3).

VANOC reiterated similar sentiments. Its position is that the Olympic Games will not solve the issues in the downtown eastside by 2010. The administrator contended that the Games are a means to act as a catalyst for organizations and because VANOC will cease to exist in 2010, it is important to create post Olympic legacies such as Olympic Village/Social housing legacy (VANOC Administrator) by working with the community:

We are not going to solve the issue in the next three or four years...and this is why we invest within the community structures that are and if you are creating new ones, is that because they are more comprehensive and it's a lot more inclusive than some of the issues that you are trying to address (VANOC Administrator).

With respect to the sectoral tables, the administrator was the only one to discuss a necessary timeframe and discussed the tables which would begin in the fall:

The social agenda right now our budgets are intact and our goal is really in the first three years versus the games in 2010. But if I look at when we need to achieve a lot of the ICI commitments are really this year (2006), next year and 2008. If we haven't achieved by 2008, we have some very unique challenges in front of us so the direction and clarity will be there (VANOC Administrator).

The administrator described the timeline for the sectoral tables and games to include venue development and associated economic and employment strategies by 2007, culture and sports program by 2006, housing by the end of 2007, and ticket distribution by 2009 (VANOC Administrator).

In summary, with respect to organizational outcomes, both LGNOW and the VA, who saw their organizations as continuing to exist after the games are hosted primarily viewed the Olympic Games and 2010 as an opportunity to leverage for desired organizational outcomes. In regards to their inter-organizational relationships, both organizations primarily saw the sectoral tables as being responsible for their own evaluation frameworks including creating indicators and timeframes. VANOC, the only organization that will knowingly cease to exist after the Olympic Games, identified planning and hosting the games and addressing the ICI commitment

statements as its primary responsibility, but agreed that the sectoral tables would be responsible for evaluation.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Discussion

Critics have continually discussed how the focus of the Olympic Games has shifted from merely a sporting event to one encompassing opportunities for leveraging for urban renewal. The findings of this study confirm that the VA does acknowledge Vancouver hosting the 2010 Winter Olympic Games as a catalyst to revitalize the DTES. Administrators from the three organizations interviewed identified their organizational involvement to be primarily fulfilling the ICICS by using the Olympic Games as a catalyst to accelerate social programs and policies focused on the DTES, while ensuring the revitalization efforts do not result in gentrification and further marginalization of residents in the area. This aligns with Burbank and Heying's (2001) "tourist bubble" or Bauman's (cited in Whitson and Horne, 2006) concept of the "socio-cultural bubble" and how cities hosting hallmark events create specific planning focused on highlighting the positive characteristics of the city while shielding the visiting public from those areas that connote a less favorable image as a destination city. While the problems to be addressed are large scale and long term in nature, VANOC, LGNOW and the VA have all demonstrated a commitment by taking positive steps towards addressing the social impacts of these Olympic Games as outlined in the ICICS.

Although each organization's definition of social development varied, each is centered on community engagement and providing adequate social housing through an integrated strategy that also addresses the other existing social issues in the DTES including, but not limited to, mental illness, drug abuse, and poverty. This was connected to avoiding another Expo '86 catastrophe where local residents were displaced and some even died as a result. The organizations are focused on mitigating the negative impacts of hosting this hallmark event in

one of the most marginalized communities in the country. The balancing act requires allowing the inevitable economic investment in line with hosting these Olympic Games, while minimizing the social impacts of these economic investments by investing resources needed to improve the DTES. Assessing the success of this initiative is well beyond the scope of this study, because it cannot be adequately measured until well after the Olympic Games have been hosted.

Inter-organizationally, perhaps the greatest challenge seems to be jurisdiction. Although administrators agreed on the social issues to be tackled and the factors that have facilitated their relationship up to this point, the largest discrepancy was found to be on organizational jurisdiction. All organizations identified that respecting and working within their and each other's mandate must be ensured. When asked about such mandates, administrators responded similarly with respect to the VA's and LGNOW's role, but differed with VANOC's.

Administrators primarily identified VANOC ultimately being responsible for organizing and hosting the games, to which the VANOC administrator responded that all the signatories together, not VANOC alone, is responsible for the organizing and hosting of these Olympic Games.

Even with the discrepancy in the organizational role and mandate, administrators also spoke of both non ICIS and ICIS related inter-organizational strategies that they were involved in. Because the VA's and LGNOW's mandates extend beyond the ICIS, working on social development in the DTES was a priority for both of these organizations. However for VANOC who identified its mandate as being focused on organizing and hosting the Olympic Games and fulfilling the ICIS, a tension certainly exists. The VANOC administrator spoke how on one hand, it has already fulfilled its promise for 250 units of social housing in the Olympic Village, yet also spoke of working outside the ICIS to achieve Olympic related benefits, for example, in arts and

culture. This change in organizational jurisdiction can have broader implications regarding what are and are not “Olympic Games” related activities. VANOC has remained silent with respect to the SkyTrain line from downtown Vancouver to the YVR airport and the Sea-to-Sky Highway development on North Vancouver’s Eagleridge Bluffs. Although such examples may not literally be Olympic Games related or within social development initiative for the inner city, they do greatly coincide with these Olympic Games and could open the door for VANOC to have to raise a voice in order to overcome potential negative legacies.

Vancouver faces the heavy burden of being one of the first host cities to take serious steps towards addressing the social impacts of hosting its Olympic Games. But the burden may be even greater to succeed. The sectoral tables have been identified by administrators as the cornerstone in realizing the ICICS. This study recommends the sectoral tables continue and remain focused on community engagement through its WorkGroups, to establish the recommendations that the Steering Committee would then implement. One challenge among many includes the need to adequately and promptly establish timelines and indicators for an evaluation framework. This concern will certainly continue to grow as the Games are rapidly approaching. The time to draft, implement, and evaluate strategies surrounding these ICIS make this even more daunting.

The second challenge surrounding the sectoral tables includes the senior decision-maker’s commitment to implementing the recommendations made from the WorkGroups. Although administrators spoke of the government’s and VANOC’s Board of Director’s intention to implement the recommendations, the commitment has not been confirmed by government and according to an administrator, remains a challenge with VANOC’s Board of Directors. This

commitment is crucial to ensuring the recommendations that the community itself has created and identifies significant do indeed materialize.

The final challenge in relation to the sectoral table is around its public engagement strategy. All administrators spoke of the need to continue to engage the community in realizing the ICIS. VANOC spoke of its public forums, community links, and its quarterly financial statements as means of engaging and informing the public. However, the extent of the public forums and community links in relation to access to information (i.e. who is invited, how they are invited and the accuracy of its financial statements in the midst of increasing financial costs) may become potential issues needing resolutions. Even formally publishing sectoral tables recommendations via print or internet may be an option to inform the public around sensitive topics, such as the Olympic Games and its impact on housing which was identified as a growing concern by all administrators.

They also acknowledge that one of the key factors in addressing the commitments will be the level of community engagement they can foster. The community consultation process described during the bid phase offers hope for an organizing committee to finally raise the social consciousness with hosting such events. This heightened social consciousness has already returned proven results including the most obvious one - Vancouver being awarded the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. If Vancouver can continue address the social impacts of hosting its Olympic Games, it can also offer hope to the concept of sustainable development as described in the IOC's Agenda 21. On a more practical level, this heightened social consciousness offers future host cities a strategy for leveraging greater social development and revitalization of its most marginalized.

If successfully fulfilling the ICICS is equated with the potential for social development with respect to such hallmark events as the Olympic Games, then one must consider what hangs in the balance if Vancouver cannot adequately meet its commitments. The first consequence could be the legacy of broken promises to the IOC, the community, and its residents. Although it seems highly unlikely, the question remains as to what action the IOC would take towards a host city that does not fulfill its bid promises, especially when one considers the organizing committee typically dissolves six months to a year after the Games have been hosted. But perhaps the greater consequence could be to the community and the residents, who in this case are being promised social returns. This risk was identified by administrators who contend that expectations now need to be more realistic. This shift in expectations raises a question about whether the ICICS merely a marketing tool to win Vancouver the Olympic Games or are they in fact a sincere attempt by the organizers and implementing partners to address social impacts? Administrators acknowledge that, along with the increasing financial cost of hosting the Olympic Games, community concerns may also shift and question the successful implementation of the ICICS. However, continuous community engagement was identified by administrators as the key to addressing this issue.

But perhaps the greatest consequence of Vancouver's failure would be to the Olympic Games themselves. If Vancouver cannot adequately demonstrate that the Olympic Games can extend beyond economic impacts for business and political elites, then the Olympic Movement may have a finite future.

5. 2 Research Implications

5.2.1 Corporate Social Responsibility and Stakeholder Management

This study drew on both corporate social responsibility and stakeholder theory as its theoretical framework to examine the social development initiative in question. The concept of social responsibility addressed within the CSR literature and the concept of including those with a “stake” rather than a “stock” in a given issue as found in stakeholder theory provided the theoretical backdrop for understanding the social development initiative.

The overall framework proposed in this study included working with Margolis and Walsh’s five-step descriptive model (2003) to understand the three goals of stakeholder management (Wolfe & Putler, 2002). First, this study showed how managers can work with their stakeholders (e.g. how during the bid phase with community stakeholders to develop the ICICS) and the how the three organizations are working to achieve the commitments outlined in the ICICS. Second, it was able to identify what administrators have done in the past regarding stakeholders, most notably the process described by administrators on how the ICICS was created. Finally, learning from administrators about the factors currently or potentially constraining organizational relationships, one is able to predict what can happen around the ICICS if administrators continue to engage their stakeholders, in this case potentially working towards the commitments outlined in the ICICS.

These three benefits link directly to the three theoretical approaches found in stakeholder theory: normative, descriptive and instrumental. What administrators wished to do with respect to the SDI links directly with normative stakeholder theory and is relates to the findings from section 4.1 and 4.4. What the administrators are currently doing links with descriptive stakeholder theory approach and relates to both the ICICS and non ICICS related initiatives as

outlined in findings from section 4.2. How these organizations have been able to work together links with instrumental stakeholder theory and relates the constraining and facilitating relationship factors outlined in section 4.3.

Using Friedman et al's (2004) concept of the focal organization was helpful in understanding the VA's role at the centre of the SDI. Because revitalizing the DTES is the VA's primary responsibility with or without the Olympic Games, and both VANOC and LGNOW exist for and because of this event, it was important to take their respective roles into account.

The framework was also successful in being able to draw on Mitchell et al's (1997) concept of the stake to identify address the first step of Margolis and Walsh's Descriptive Model of identifying social issues to address. The study concludes that the "stake" or the social development initiative in question was learning what the social development and revitalization of the DTES consisted of and examining how these organizations aim to use the Olympic Games to address the issues involved. The findings in section 4.1 relating to the first research question not only helped to identify the social development initiative but some of the social issues trying to be addressed within it as well.

This study proposed using Wolfe and Putler's (2002) stakeholder analysis model as an intermediary step between Margolis and Walsh's descriptive model's first and second step. The model was to be used to identify appropriate stakeholders and how the focal organization should work them as it "attempts to classify stakeholders into categories that provide an understanding of how stakeholder groups can influence a firm" (Wolfe & Putler, 2002, p. 65). Using Friedman et al.'s (2004) four prerequisites, VANOC and LGNOW were stakeholders in the VA because it has a connection to the organization based on the mutual work they and the VA are engaged in regards to the ICICS. VANOC and LGNOW represent definable interests including achieving

the commitments in the ICICS and this interest does entitle them to the right to exist in the stakeholder relationship. Finally, VANOC is a single group consisting of similar interests to the VA. And using Clarkson's (1995) definitions of stakeholders, VANOC and LGNOW were secondary stakeholders because although the VA can function without their participation in the relationship, its revitalization efforts of the DTES would be seriously hampered if it was not able to work with them to leverage the Olympic Games for social development.

After working through the first step of Wolfe and Putler's (2002) stakeholder analysis model and identifying stakeholder roles, which ties into the second step of Margolis and Walsh's descriptive model of generating response options since working with stakeholders to generate such response is the whole premise of stakeholder management, the study was able to work identify both VANOC's and LGNOW stakeholder saliency. Identifying stakeholder saliency is the second step of the stakeholder analysis model, but to determine stakeholder saliency, the study referred to Mitchell et al.'s (1997) stakeholder identification model. Here VANOC was identified as a definitive stakeholder possessing all three variables of power, legitimacy and urgency. VANOC has the power to be heard in the stakeholder relationship. Although VA's mandate does not necessarily include achieving the goals outlined in the ICICS, they nonetheless overlap quite well and provide a reason for VANOC to remain committed to the stakeholder relationship. As well, the power, size and potential of the Olympic Games provides VANOC with power. The overlap between the ICICS and the VA's mandate also provides VANOC with legitimacy and a voice in the relationship. The timeliness of the Olympic Games, that they are approaching in 2010, also provides VANOC with saliency in urgency as well.

The same can be said to LGNOW in regards to its stakeholder saliency. Because of the strength of its relationship to the VA which was highlighted several times by administrators, it

provides LGNOW with power to have its voice, especially in regards to initiatives it is directly involved in with the VA such as the CHILL program. Having proven its ability to be an admirable partner, this has also provided LGNOW with legitimacy in the stakeholder relationship. Finally, because LGNOW's mandate is to develop province wide legacies as a result of the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games, it is also holds high saliency in regards to urgency because the window to leverage the Olympic Games for LGNOW related initiatives is shrinking. Thus, for different but overlapping reasons, both VANOC and LGNOW have been identified through this study as definitive stakeholders based on Mitchell et al.'s (1997) stakeholder identification model.

Incorporating Margolis and Walsh's (2003) five step descriptive model, this study completed step one: appraising the stimuli and using Wolfe and Putler's (2002) six step stakeholder analysis model, worked as far as step four: developing priority based clusters. The primary reason why this study has only gone as far as step one of the descriptive model are multiple. The first is quite simply the time constraints of the study. To properly follow through the five steps and measure the consequences would take longer than the scope of this study. More importantly, although the social issue has been identified as revitalizing the DTES, this process is undoubtedly a long and lengthy one that will include multiple strategies. This combined with the general infancy of the stakeholder relationship in relation to the time to the Olympic Games, the fact that the sectoral tables which are the primary means for addressing the social development initiative have only begun, means that reaching step 5 of the descriptive model will be an ongoing process. For example, one VA administrator acknowledged that adequately revitalizing the DTES would take up to 20-30 years. Therefore, this study can only offer a glimpse of administrator perspectives on the process at one point along the way.

5.3 Future Research

If Vancouver can demonstrate that working with those who hold a stake rather than a stock in planning and hosting the Olympic Games can be achieved, it would also offer hope to the further application of stakeholder management. Based on Vancouver's commitment to addressing the social impacts of hosting the Olympic Games via the ICICS, it could provide a rationale for normative stakeholder theory. If post games research can determine the extent to which the ICICS were fulfilled and how, it could then become an example of descriptive stakeholder theory and what an organizing committee could do to reach the goals based on normative stakeholder theory. The indicators to measure how descriptive stakeholder theory was applied would provide evidence of instrumental stakeholder theory and a framework for measurement and evaluation. Therefore it is imperative for the sectoral tables to develop appropriate longitudinal indicators, measurement and evaluation frameworks, and conduct research to determine what has been achieved and how.

Future research could also deal with the limitations of this study. For example, obtaining greater organizational representation by including community groups affected by the social development initiative would reveal additional stakeholder perspectives. Methodologically, future research could also explore combining face-to-face interviews with either organizational or inter-organizational focus groups or follow up interviews in order to reach greater data saturation. Combining the data collection approaches in a longitudinal research design would provide further insights, although access and gate keeping will continue to be issues for researchers given the political environment of the Olympic Games.

Theoretically, the recommendation for future research would be to continue to examine theoretical integration between CSR and stakeholder management theory. This study was unable to examine each step of Margolis and Walsh's (2003) descriptive model or Wolfe and Putler's

(2002) stakeholder analysis model. This opens to the door for further theoretical integration, especially as they relate to measurement and evaluation.

REFERENCES

- Andranovich, G., Burbank, M., and Heying, C. (2001). Olympic cities: Lessons learned from mega – event politics. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 23, (2), 113 – 131.
- Babiak, Katherine M. (2003). *Examining partnerships in amateur sport: The case of a Canadian national sport centre*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Beaver, William. (1999). Is the stakeholder model dead? *Business Horizons*, 42, (2), 8 – 12.
- Britten, N. (1999). Qualitative Interviews in Health Care Research. In Pope, C. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Health Care*, (pp. 11 – 19). London, England, BMJ Books.
- Burton, Rick. (2003). Olympic Games host city marketing: An exploration of expectations and outcomes. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12, 1, 35 – 45.
- Caroll, Archie, B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, (4), 1991.
- Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation. (2002). *Women and housing in Canada: Barriers to equality*. Toronto, Canada: author. Last retrieved from <http://www.equalityrights.org/cera/docs/barriers.htm>
- City of Vancouver. (2006). *2010 winter games update*. Last retrieved, December 7, 2006 from <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/olympics/chronology.htm>.
- Clarkson, Max B. E. (1995). A Stakeholder Framework for Analysing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance. *Academy of Management Review* 20: 92-117.
- Collins, Eva, Kearins, Kate & Roper, Juliet. (2005). The risks in relying on stakeholder engagement for the achievement of sustainability. *Electronic Journal of Radical Organization Theory*, 9, 1, 19 – 39.
- Community Social Planning Council of Toronto. (2000). *A socio – economic impact and equity plan for the 2008 Olympic Games*. Toronto Canada: author.
- Coombs, Timothy W. (2002). Assessing online issue threats: Issue contagions and their effect on issue prioritisation. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 2, (4), 215 – 229.
- Coalter, Fred Allison, Mary & Taylor, John. (2000). *The role of sport in regenerating deprived areas*. Edinburgh, Scotland: The Scottish Executive Central Research Unit.

Donaldson, Thomas & Dunfee, Thomas W. (1994). Towards a unified conception of business ethics: Integrative social contracts theory. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 19, No 2, 252 – 284.

Donaldson, Thomas & Preston, Lee. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence and implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20, (1), 65 – 91.

Donnelly Peter & Coakley Jay. (2002). *The role of recreation in promoting social inclusion*. Toronto, Canada: Laidlaw Foundation.

Ference Weicker & Company. (2002). *Community assessment of 2010 Winter Olympic Games and Paralympic Games on Vancouver inner – city neighbourhoods*. Vancouver, Canada: author.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, USA: Pitman Ballinger.

Friedman, Michael T. & Mason, Daniel S. (2004). A stakeholder approach to understanding economic development decision making: Public subsidies for professional sport facilities. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 18, 3, 236 – 254.

Friedman, Michael T., Parent, Milena M. & Mason, Daniel S. (2004). Building a framework for Issues Management in Sport through Stakeholder Theory. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 4, 170 – 190.

Greenpeace USA. (2006). *Greenpeace executive director congratulates coca-cola on move away from greenhouse gases ahead of green Olympics in Sydney*. Last retrieved May 30, 2007, from <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/press/releases/greenpeace-executive-director-2>.

Hall, C. Michael. (2006). Urban entrepreneurship, corporate interests and sports mega-events: The thin policies of competitiveness within the hard outcomes of neoliberalism. *Sociological Review*, 54, 2, 59 – 70.

Hall, C.M. and Hodges, J. (1997). Sharing the spirit of corporatism and cultural capital: the politics of place and identity in the Sydney 2000 Olympics. In M. Roche (ed), *Sport, Popular Culture and Identity* (95 – 112) Verlag, Aachen: Meyer & Meyer.

Hammersley, M & Atkinson, P. (1995).) *Ethnography: Principals and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hargreaves, Jennifer. (1997). Women's sport: Development, and cultural diversity: The South African experience. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 20, (2), 191 – 202.

Haxton, Peter A. (1999). Community involvement and the Olympic games – a review of related research. *7th International Post Graduate Seminar on Olympic Studies*. (142 – 164). International Olympic Academy.

Hiller, Harry. (1990). The urban transformation of a landmark event: The 1988 Calgary Winter Olympics. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 1, (26), 188 -137.

Hine, C. (2000). The virtual objects of ethnography. In C. Hine (author) *Virtual ethnography* (Chapter 3, pp. 40 – 66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horne, John @ Manzenreiter, Wolfman. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *Sociological Review*, 54, 2, 1 – 24.

Humphreys, Jeffery M & Plummer, Michael, K. (2000) *The economic impact of hosting the 1996 Olympic Games*. Last retrieved, November 12, 2006, from <http://www.selig.uga.edu/forecast/olympics/OLYMTEXT.HTM>.

Huxam, Chris & Vangen, Siv. (1996). Working together: Key themes in the management of relationships between public and non-profit organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9, 7, 5 – 17.

Impact of the Olympics on Community Coalition. (2002). *Recommendations made by the impact of the Olympics on community coalition to the Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation and its member partners, August 2002*. Vancouver, Canada: Author.

Jarvie, Grant. (2003). Communitarianism, sport and social capital. *International Review for the sociology of sport*, 38, (2), 189 – 153.

Jennings, Andrew & Simson, Vyv. (1992). *The lords of the rings: Power, money and drugs in the modern Olympics*. Toronto, Canada: Stoddart.

International Olympic Committee. *Olympic Movement's Agenda 21*. Last retrieved on November 24, 2006 from multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_300.pdf

Kidd, Bruce. (1992). The Toronto Olympic Commitment: Towards a social contract for the Olympic Games. *International Journal of Olympic Studies*, 1, 154 – 167.

Jones, Lange LaSalle and LaSalle Investment Management. (2001). *Reaching Beyond the Gold: The Impact of the Olympic Games on Real Estate Markets*. Author.

Lasker, Roz, D. & Weiss, Elisa S. (2003). Creating partnership synergy: The critical role of community stakeholders. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 26, 119 – 139.

Lachman, Ran & Wolfe, Richard A. (1997). The interface of organizational effectiveness and corporate social performance: Opportunities for research and theory development. *Business and Society*, 36, 2, 194 – 214.

Lenskyj, Helen Jefferson. (2000). *Inside the Olympic Industry: Power, politics, and activism*. State University of New York, Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Lewis, R.B (1998). ATLAS/ti and NUD-IST: A comparative review of two leading qualitative analysis packages. *Cultural Anthropology Methods*, 10, 41 – 47.

Manheim, Jarol, B. (1990). Rites of passage: The 1988 Seoul Olympics as public diplomacy. *Western Political Quarterly*, 43, 2, 279 – 295.

Margolis, Joshua D and Walsh, James P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 268 – 305.

Mitchell, Ronald K. Agle, Bradley R & Wood, Donna W. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, (4), 853 – 886.

Munoz, Francisc. (2006). Olympic urbanism and Olympic villages: Planning strategies in Olympic host cities, London 1908 and London 2012. *Sociological Review*, 54, 2, 175 – 187.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. New York, USA: Pearson Publishing.

Olds, Kris. (1996). *Hallmark events, eviction and housing rights: The Canadian Case*. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada: Centre for Human Settlements, School of Community and Regional Planning.

Olympic Oval. *Olympics*. Retrieved May 30, 2007, from <http://oval.sunergon.com/Olympics/tabid/81/Default.aspx>

Owen, K.A. (2002). The Sydney 2000 Olympics and urban entrepreneurialism: Local variations in urban governance. *Australian Geographic Studies*, 40, 3, 323 – 336.

Pivot Legal Society. (2006). *Cracks in the foundation: Solving the housing crisis in Canada's poorest neighbourhood*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: author.

Preuss, H. (1998). Problemizing Arguments of the Opponents of Olympic Games. In Barney, R.K., Wamsley, K.B., Martyn, S.G. & MacDonald, G.H. (Eds.) 4. *Global and Cultural Critique: Problematizing the Olympic Games*. (197-218). London, Ontario, Canada: International Symposium for Olympic Research.

- Right to Play. (2006). *Right to play at a glance*. Last retrieved May 30, 2007, from <http://www.richtoplay.com/site/PageServer?pagename=overview>.
- Ritchie, Brent. (2000). Turning 16 days into 16 years through Olympic legacies. *Event Management*, Vol. 6, 155 – 165.
- Ritchie, J.R.B & Aitken, C. (1984). Assessing the impacts of the 1988 Olympic Winter Games: The research program and initial results. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22, (3), 17 – 25.
- Ritchie, J.R.B and Aitken, C. (1985). Olympulse II: Evolving resident attitudes towards the 1988 Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23, (3), 28 – 33.
- Ritchie, J.R.B & Lyons, M. (1987). Olympulse III/ Olympulse IV: A mid-term report on resident attitudes concerning the XV Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26, (1), 18 – 26.
- Ritchie, J.R.B and Lyons, M. (1990). Olympulse VI: A post – event assessment of resident reaction to the XV Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28, (3), 14 – 23.
- Searle, Glen. (2002). Uncertain legacy: Sydney’s Olympic stadium. *European Planning Studies*, 10, 7, 845 – 860.
- Spiropoulos, Spiros, Gargalianos, Dimitris & Sotiriadou, Kalliopi. (2006). The 20th Greek Festival of Sydney: A stakeholder analysis. *Event Management*, 9, 169 – 183.
- Svendsen, Ann. (1998). *The stakeholder strategy: Profiting from collaborative business strategies*. San Francisco, USA. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Tomlinson, Frances. (2005). Idealistic and pragmatic versions of the discourse partnership. *Organization studies*, 26, 8, 1169 – 1188.
- Van Buren, Harry J & Paul, Karen. Company reactions to socially responsible investing: An empirical analysis. In Clarkson Centre of Business Ethics (Eds). *Research in Stakeholder Theory, 1997-1998: The Sloan Foundation Minigrant Project*, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Clarkson Centre of Business Ethics.
- Vancouver Agreement (2005a). *Downtown eastside receives \$2 million to boost community’s economy*. Last retrieved on December 7, 2006 from www.vancouveragreement.ca/Pdfs/05%2001%2019%20%20DTES%20Funding%20Announcement.pdf
- Vancouver Agreement. (2005b). *Media Advisory: Vancouver Agreement wins United Nations Award*. Retrieved August 24, 2005, from <http://www.vancouveragreement.ca/Pdfs/050506ADVISORYUNAward.pdf>

Vancouver Agreement, (2005c). *News Release: Vancouver Agreement renewed for second five – year term*. Retrieved August 24, 2005 from <http://www.vancouveragreement.ca/Pdfs/050329RenewalNEWSRELEASE.pdf>

Vancouver Agreement. (2005d). *2010 Winter Games Inner – City Inclusive Intent Statement*. Retrieved August 24, 2005 from <http://www.vancouveragreement.ca/Pdfs/02%2010%2009%20Bid%20Corporation%20Intent%20Statement.pdf>

Vancouver Agreement. (2005e). *The Vancouver Agreement*. Retrieved on August 24, 2005: from www.vancouveragreement.ca

Vancouver Agreement. (2004). *Vancouver Agreement wins highest award for innovative public service management*. Last retrieved December 8, 2006 from <http://vancouveragreement.ca/Attached%20Documents/Awardpublicservice.pdf>

Vancouver Agreement. (2003). *A strategic plan*. Last retrieved December 8, 2006 from <http://vancouveragreement.ca/Pdfs/Strategic%20plan-english.pdf>.

Vancouver Agreement. (2000). *A framework for action: A four pillar approach to drug problems in Vancouver*. Last retrieved December 8, 2006 from <http://www.vancouveragreement.ca/Attached%20Documents/frameworkforaction.pdf>

Vancouver Whistler 2010 Bid Society. (1998) *2010 Olympic Winter Games: Bid book for submission to the Canadian Olympic Association*. Vancouver, Canada: author. Last retrieved December 8, 2006 from <http://www.vancouver2010.com/en/OrganizingCommittee/AboutOrganizingCommittee/BidHistory/BidBook>.

Vancouver Organizing Committee. (2008) *Inner-City Inclusivity (ICI)*. Vancouver, Canada: author. Last retrieved February 25, 2008 from www.vancouver2010.com/resources/PDFs/ICI_update.pdf

Vancouver Organizing Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. (2006). *Board of Directors*. Last retrieved December 7, 2006 from <http://www.vancouver2010.com/en/OrganizingCommittee/AboutOrganizingCommittee/BoardDirectors>

Weech-Maldonado Robert, Benson, Keith J. & Gamm, Larry, D. (2003). Evaluating the effectiveness of community health partnerships: A stakeholder accountability approach. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 26, 58 – 92.

Western Economic Diversification Canada. (2004) *Vancouver Agreement - A Governance Case Study*. Government of Canada. Last retrieved December 8, 2006 from http://www.wd.gc.ca/rpts/audit/va/default_e.asp.

Whitson, David & Macintosh, Donald. (1993). Becoming a World-Class City: Hallmark Events and Sport Franchises in the Growth Strategies of Western Canadian Cities. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 221-240.

Whitson, David & Horne, John. (2006). Underestimated costs and overestimated benefits? Comparing the outcomes of sports mega-events in Canada and Japan. *Sociological Review*, 54, 2, 71 – 89.

Willis, Owen. (2000). Sport and development: The significance of Mathare Youth Sports Association. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 21, (3), 829 – 849.

Wilson, Helen. (1996). What is an Olympic city? Visions of Sydney 2000. *Media, Culture and Society*. 18, 603 – 618.

Wolfe, Richard, & Putler, Daniel S. (2002). How tight are the ties that bind stakeholder groups? *Organization Science*, 13, (1), 65 – 80.

APPENDIX

Appendix A1 – Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement

Appendix A1 has been removed due because of copyright restrictions. The information removed is VANOC's Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement also including the different areas and goals within each.

Appendix A1 can be found at

<http://www.vancouver2010.com/en/OrganizingCommittee/AboutOrganizingCommittee/BidHistory/BidBook>.

Appendix A2 – Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement – Update

Appendix A2 has been removed due because of copyright restrictions. The information removed is VANOC's updated Inner City Inclusive Commitment Statement.

Appendix A2 can be found at

www.vancouver2010.com/resources/PDFs/ICI_update.pdf



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix B1 – Agency Information Sheet

[date]

Dear [VA, VANOC, or LGNOW staff person]

A graduate student, Param Chauhan, from the School of Human Kinetics at the University of British Columbia is conducting a research study entitled *A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development*. He became interested in this topic after completing a placement with the LegaciesNow Society and Dr. Wendy Frisby is his research supervisor. We are inviting you and your organization to participate in this endeavor. The information being collected is to be used for Param's Master's Thesis from UBC. This information may as well be in the future for other scholarly productions such as journal articles and conference presentations. A summary report of the work resulting from the project will be provided to you at the conclusion of the study.

As the title suggests, the research goal is to better understand the roles and involvement of stakeholders involved in the Vancouver Agreement with respect to the planning and hosting of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. An appropriate way to examine what can be done to maximize opportunities and mitigate impacts to an Olympic host city's inner city neighbourhoods is to hear from those involved in this initiative.

With your permission we hope to conduct face to face interviews with 2-3 administrators from your organization. An initial letter of consent will be given to them which explains the research in writing and also a letter of consent should they be interested in participating. The focus group will be centred on their experiences with the Vancouver Agreement and the 2010 Winter Olympic Games and what they feel are the important considerations in regards to this initiative. The graduate student will ask their permission to audio tape record the interviews for accuracy. They will also be provided with the opportunity to read the transcripts from these interviews. The total amount of time required for this study will be 45 – 60 minutes. Only Param Chauhan, the graduate student and Dr. Wendy Frisby, the Research Supervisor will have access to the transcripts from these interviews, which will be named by code to ensure confidentiality and kept in a secure computer file in a locked research office. The names of the administrators will not be identified in the reporting of the results.

Please understand that your agency's involvement in this project is entirely voluntary. If you decide to participate, you will always have the option of withdrawing at any time during the study. Please call either the principal researcher Param Chauhan [REDACTED] or the Research Supervisor (Wendy Frisby 604 822 – 3018, frisby@interchange.ubc.ca) if you have any questions or concerns. Additionally, if you have questions or concerns about your agency's rights or treatment as a research subject please contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

It is our intent to provide your organization with a summary report at the end of the study. If you agree to participate, please sign the attached form and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerley,

Param Chauhan
Graduate Student
[REDACTED]

Wendy Frisby, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Research Supervisor
(604) 822 – 3018



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix B2 - Agency Consent Form (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement)

A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development

I have read the attached *Agency Information Sheet* and understand the nature of the study as described.

I understand that my agency's participation in the study (entitled "A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development") is entirely voluntary and refusal to participate or withdraw from the study is entitled at any time. I have received a copy of the agency information sheet and a copy of this consent form for my own records.

I consent to my agency's participation in this study.

Participant Signature

Date

Signature of Witness

Date

**Please return this form in the enclosed
self-addressed stamped envelope**



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix C1 – Initial Letter of Consent (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement)

Date

Dear [insert name of VA, LGNOW, or VANOC staff person]

A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development

This letter requests your participation in a face to face interview Param Chauhan is running through the University of British Columbia for his masters degree in the School of Human Kinetics. He became interested in this study after completing a placement with the LegaciesNow Society.

The interview will take between 45-60 minutes and will be scheduled on a date and time convenient for you. You have been identified as someone who is currently working in the Vancouver Agreement with respect to the planning and hosting of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, and we would like to ask you for your opinions regarding this important initiative. The project intends to analyze stakeholder views on how the Olympic Games can be used to address social issues affecting an Olympic host city's inner-city neighborhoods. A summary report will be provided to all those who take part in the study.

An Information Sheet and Consent Form are attached. Please take a minute to read them over. If you are willing to participate in the interview, please sign the consent form and return it to Param Chauhan in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. If you have any concerns about individual rights or treatment as a research subject please contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

Sincerely,

Param Chauhan
Graduate Student
[REDACTED]

Wendy Frisby, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Research Supervisor
(604) 822 – 3018



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix C2 – Information Sheet (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement)

A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development

INTERVIEW INFORMATION SHEET

Researchers:

Param Chauhan
Graduate Student

Wendy Frisby
Research Supervisor
(604) 822 – 3018

School of Human Kinetics – University of British Columbia (UBC)

What is the interview for?

In this graduate student thesis, stakeholders in the Vancouver Agreement with respect to the planning and hosting of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games are being asked about their roles and involvement. It is intended to help us better understand what might be done to maximize the opportunities and mitigate the impacts to an Olympic host city's inner-city neighborhoods.

What do the participants do?

Administrators will meet at a time and location convenient for you. to discuss your involvement in the Vancouver Agreement.

Who is running it?

Param Chauhan, a graduate student in the School of Human Kinetics at the University of British Columbia is the primary researcher. Dr. Wendy Frisby, an associate professor in the School of Human Kinetics and Chair in Women's Studies at the University of British Columbia, is the Research Supervisor.

What about privacy?

All information resulting from the interview will be kept strictly confidential and the names of interviewees will not be identified in the reporting of the data. The interview will be audiotaped and transcribed, and the tapes and transcripts will be assigned codes and kept in a locked file. *Consent forms* (attached) will be kept separately from the

interview materials in a sealed envelope and locked file. According to University of British Columbia regulations, the data will be stored for five years and then destroyed by shredding (paper) or erasure (tapes).

What will the results be used for?

The interview findings will be published in an academic graduate student thesis and potential articles. The goal is to better understand how the VA can maximize benefits and mitigate impacts with respect to the planning and hosting of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. This information will be used to make recommendations about how to improve policies and programs.

Is participation voluntary?

Administrator's participation in the interview is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without prejudice.

Further information, questions or concerns?

If you have further questions or a desire to speak further about this research, please contact Param Chauhan at [REDACTED] or ([REDACTED]). Dr. Wendy Frisby, the Research Supervisor, can be contacted at (604) 822 – 3018 or (frisby@interchange.ubc.ca).

If you have any concerns about individual rights or treatment as a research subject please contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

The Ethics Committee of the University of British Columbia has reviewed and approved this project.



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix C3 – Participant Consent Form (Vancouver Organizing Committee, 2010 Legacies Now Society, Vancouver Agreement)

A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development

I have read the attached *Information Sheet* and understand the nature of the study as described in the *Information Sheet*. I have a copy of the *Information Sheet* for my own records.

I understand that my participation in the study (entitled “A stakeholder approach to understanding the role of the Olympics in social development”) is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy to my employment, or standing in the sport and recreation community. I have received a copy of the letter of initial contact, information sheet and a copy of this consent form for my own records.

I consent to participate in this study.

Participant Signature

Date

Signature of Witness

Date

I consent to having the interview tape recorder to ensure accuracy

Participant Signature

Date

**Please return this form in the enclosed
self-addressed stamped envelope**



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix D1 – Sample Face to Face Interview Questions for the Vancouver Agreement

Research Question 1:

How do the stakeholders (VA, VANOC and the 2010 Legacies Now Society) define the social development issue(s) underpinning their involvement in the Vancouver Agreement (VA)?

- 1) What is your official position within the Vancouver Agreement (VA)?
 - a. What are your primary responsibilities?
 - b. How and when did you become involved in the VA?
 - c. What are your responsibilities in relation to the VA?
 - i. Have these changed over time?
- 2) How do you view the social development component of the VA?
 - a. What do you see as the key issues to be addressed?
 - b. How does this relate to what the Vancouver Agreement is trying to accomplish?

Research Question 2:

How do VA, VANOC and 2010 Legacies Now Society see their role/interests in the VA?

- 3) What does the VA hope to accomplish through the Vancouver Agreement?
- 4) How will the VA goals in relation to the Vancouver Agreement be assessed?
 - a. Who will be responsible for evaluating them?
 - b. What indicators will be used?
 - c. What is the time frame?
- 5) In relation to the work being done with 2010 Legacies Now Society and VANOC, what role has the VA assumed in the Vancouver Agreement?
 - a. What is the VA contributing to the Vancouver Agreement?
 - b. Does this involvement connect with other initiatives being undertaken by the VA?

- 6) What role do you believe VANOC has assumed in the Vancouver Agreement?
 - a. What role do you believe the 2010 Legacies Now Society has assumed in the Vancouver Agreement?
 - b. Who is taking on major leadership roles around the VA and why?

- 7) What strategies is the VA using to achieve their interests in the Vancouver Agreement?
 - a. Do you believe these strategies are working? How so?
 - b. Have these strategies changed from when you began your work up until now?
 - i. Do you see these strategies changing as we approach 2010?
 - ii. In 2010?
 - iii. After 2010?

Research Question 3:

What factors are facilitating or constraining the sustainability of the relationship between the VA, VANOC and the 2010 Legacies Now Society?

- 8) Have there been any benefits for the VA by working with the 2010 Legacies Now Society and VANOC?

- 9) Have you encountered any challenges working with the 2010 Legacies Now Society and VANOC on the Vancouver Agreement?
 - a. How are you working to overcome them?
 - b. Have they changed from the time you first became involved?

Research Question 4:

What outcomes do the VA, VANOC, and the 2010 Legacies Now Society hope to accomplish in the VA and how will these be assessed?

- 10) Do you see these benefits/challenges changing over time, from now to 2010?
 - a. In 2010?
 - b. After 2010?

- 11) This is one of the first Olympic Games that has taken serious steps to address a social development agenda. What do you see as the key ingredients/components to ensure the long term sustainability/viability of this and other potential social development initiatives?

- 12) Is there any thing else that you would like to add about this topic?



The University of British
Columbia

School of Human Kinetics

210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1
Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Appendix D2 – Sample Face to Face Interview Questions for Vancouver Organizing Committee/2010 Legacies Now Society

Research Question 1:

How do the stakeholders (VA, VANOC and the 2010 Legacies Now Society) define the social development issue(s) underpinning their involvement in the Vancouver Agreement (VA)?

- 13) What is your official position within VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society?
 - a. What are your primary responsibilities?
 - b. How and when did you become involved in the VA?
 - c. What are your responsibilities in relation to the VA?
 - i. Have these changed over time?
- 14) How do you view the social development component of the VA?
 - a. What do you see as the key issues to be addressed?
 - b. How does this relate to what the VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society is trying to accomplish?

Research Question 2:

How do VA, VANOC and 2010 Legacies Now Society see their role/interests in the VA?

- 15) What does the VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society hope to accomplish through the Vancouver Agreement?
- 16) How will VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society goals in relation to the Vancouver Agreement be assessed?
 - a. Who will be responsible for evaluating them?
 - b. What indicators will be used?
 - c. What is the time frame?
- 17) In relation to the work being done with the VA, what role has the VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society assumed in the Vancouver Agreement?
 - a. What is the VA contributing to the Vancouver Agreement?

- b. Does this involvement connect with other initiatives being undertaken by the VA?
- 18) What role do you believe VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society has assumed in the Vancouver Agreement?
- a. What role do you believe the VA has assumed in the Vancouver Agreement?
 - b. Who is taking on major leadership roles around the VA and why?
- 19) What strategies is VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society using to achieve their interests in the Vancouver Agreement?
- a. Do you believe these strategies are working? How so?
 - b. Have these strategies changed from when you began your work up until now?
 - i. Do you see these strategies changing as we approach 2010?
 - ii. In 2010?
 - iii. After 2010?

Research Question 3:

What factors are facilitating or constraining the sustainability of the relationship between the VA, VANOC and the 2010 Legacies Now Society?

- 20) Have there been any benefits for VANOC/2010 Legacies Now Society by working with the VA?
- 21) Have you encountered any challenges working with the VA on the Vancouver Agreement?
- a. How are you working to overcome them?
 - b. Have they changed from the time you first became involved?

Research Question 4:

What outcomes do the VA, VANOC, and the 2010 Legacies Now Society hope to accomplish in the VA and how will these be assessed?

- 22) Do you see these benefits/challenges changing over time, from now to 2010?
- a. In 2010?
 - b. After 2010?
- 23) This is one of the first Olympic Games that has taken serious steps to address a social development agenda. What do you see as the key ingredients/components to ensure the long term sustainability/viability of this and other potential social development initiatives?
- 24) Is there any thing else that you would like to add about this topic?

Appendix E: Table of Codes

WHAT FACTORS ARE FACILITATING OR CONSTRAINING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VAS, VANOC AND 2010 Legacies Now Society?

CONSTRAINING:

CONSTRAINING: community challenges:
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS:
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS:
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS: community consultation
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS: effective communication
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS: ensure benefits dont pass DTES by
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS: ensuring realistic but flexible goals
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS: measure "variable performance" (high in some, low in others)
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: FULFILLING ICI GOALS: SOLUTION TO FULFILLING ICI GOALS: to be up front and honest

CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: legitimacy and credibility:
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: LEGITIMACY AND CREDIBILITY: including all and appropriate stakeholders:
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: LEGITIMACY AND CREDIBILITY: including all and appropriate stakeholders:
 SOLUTION TO STAKEHOLDERS:
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: LEGITIMACY AND CREDIBILITY: including all and appropriate stakeholders:
 SOLUTION TO STAKEHOLDERS: getting ICI statements into bid book
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: LEGITIMACY AND CREDIBILITY: including all and appropriate stakeholders:
 SOLUTION TO STAKEHOLDERS: putting community members on VANOC board
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: LEGITIMACY AND CREDIBILITY: including all and appropriate stakeholders:
 SOLUTION TO STAKEHOLDERS: using individual's reputation from working in DTES to create ICI WORKGROUP

CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: managing risk
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: MANAGING RISK: lack of government partnerships

CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: unrealistic expectations
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: UNREALISTIC EXPECTATIONS: lgnow
 CONSTRAINING: COMMUNITY CHALLENGES: UNREALISTIC EXPECTATIONS: va

CONSTRAINING: Government
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: Government Funding
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT FUNDING: discontinued government funding for social housing
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT FUNDING: welfare funding remains static
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: Elections
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: Government Structure
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE: multiple ministers responsible
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE: silos
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: Policy
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: Poor Policy
 CONSTRAINING: GOVERNMENT: Turnover

CONSTRAINING: inter organizational challenges:
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: appropriate performance indicators:
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: APPROPRIATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: SOLUTION TO APPROPRIATE INDICATORS:
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: APPROPRIATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: SOLUTION TO APPROPRIATE INDICATORS: IOCC as independent community watchdog

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: balancing organizational goals:
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: LGNOW -> LGNOW
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: LGNOW -> VA
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: LGNOW -> VANOC
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VA -> LGNOW

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VA -> VA
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VA -> VANOC
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VA -> VANOC: Ensure social sustainability remains on VANOC's agenda
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VANOC -> LGNOW
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VANOC -> VA
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: BALANCING ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: VANOC -> VANOC

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: funding
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: FUNDING: limited
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: FUNDING: NON EXISTENT: VANOC to manage operating costs
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: FUNDING: not strategic

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: HOW TO CARRY MOMENTUM FROM BID TO 2010 AND BEYOND

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: lofty ici commitments

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: measuring social return on investment

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: ORGANIZATIONAL turnover
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: ORGANIZATIONAL TURNOVER: LGNOW
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: ORGANIZATIONAL TURNOVER: VA
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: ORGANIZATIONAL TURNOVER: VANOC

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: REALISTIC YET FLEXIBLE GOALS

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: RESPONSIBILITY AND JURISDICTION:

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: WHEN GOALS ARE NOT ALIGNED

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT

CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: working together
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: WORKING TOGETHER: lgnow
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: WORKING TOGETHER: va
 CONSTRAINING: INTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES: WORKING TOGETHER: vanoc

FACILITATING:

FACILITATING: adding value

FACILITATING: effective communication:
 FACILITATING: EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION: lgnow
 FACILITATING: EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION: va

FACILITATING: EXPERTISE:
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: allows one to tap into existing network
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: ALLOWS ONE TO TAP INTO EXISTING NETWORK: knowledge/ideas
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: ALLOWS ONE TO TAP INTO EXISTING NETWORK: resources and people
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: ALLOWS ONE TO TAP INTO EXISTING NETWORK: stakeholders

FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: legaciesnow:
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: LEGACIESNOW: bring people to the table
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: LEGACIESNOW: can increase legitimacy when VA cannot
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: LEGACIESNOW: into culture
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: LEGACIESNOW: into sport and recreation
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: va
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: VA: able to examine entire continuum of issue
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: VA: DTES
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: VA: three levels of government
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: vanoc
 FACILITATING: EXPERTISE: VANOC :brings the rings to the table

FACILITATING: lack of turnover

FACILITATING: olympics as catalyst to reach long term goals

FACILITATING: passion

FACILITATING: PASSION: Iknow

FACILITATING: raise social awareness in Hallmark events

FACILITATING: relationship:

FACILITATING: RELATIONSHIP: Iknow

FACILITATING: RELATIONSHIP: va

FACILITATING: respect

FACILITATING: RESPECT: Iknow

FACILITATING: sectoral tables

FACILITATING: SECTORAL TABLES: determine benchmarks through sectoral tables

FACILITATING: SECTORAL TABLES: recommendations to change government

FACILITATING: SECTORAL TABLES: to be determined through sectoral tables

FACILITATING: shared values:

FACILITATING: SHARED VALUES: Iknow

FACILITATING: SHARED VALUES: va

FACILITATING: VANOC BOARD

FACILITATING: Working Together:

FACILITATING: WORKING TOGETHER: Iknow

FACILITATING: WORKING TOGETHER: va

FACILITATING: WORKING TOGETHER: vanoc

HOW DO VANOC AND 2010 Legacies Now Society SEE THEIR ROLES/INTERESTS IN THE VA AND HOW DOES THIS COMPARE WITH THE VAS'S VIEW OF BOTH VANOC'S AND 2010 Legacies Now Society'S ROLE?

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE:

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: Community Capacity Building

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: LGNOW -> LGNOW

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: LGNOW -> VA

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: LGNOW -> VANOC

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VA -> LGNOW

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VA -> VA

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VA -> VANOC

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VANOC -> LGNOW

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VANOC -> VA

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VANOC -> VANOC

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VANOC -> VANOC: community engagement

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VANOC -> VANOC: public forums

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING: VANOC -> VANOC: sectoral tables

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: Leverage:

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> LGNOW

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: Knowledge in the NOW's

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: SECTORAL TABLES: Arts and Culture

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: SECTORAL TABLES: Sport and Recreation

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA: co ordinated effort = lack of duplication/misappropriation

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA: network

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA: share information

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA: share resources

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA: shared office

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VA: work with community

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: LGNOW -> VANOC

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: VA -> LGNOW

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: VA -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: VA -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: VANOC -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: VANOC -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: ALIGN AND LEVERAGE RESOURCES: VANOC -> VANOC

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: exposure
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: about 2010 Legacies Nowconcept
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: IOC:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: IOC: CHILL: LGNOW -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: IOC: CHILL: VANOC -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: media
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: LGNOW -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: LGNOW -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: LGNOW -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: VA-> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: VA -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: VA -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: VANOC -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: VANOC -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: MEDIA: VANOC -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: sponsors:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: LGNOW -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: LGNOW -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: LGNOW -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: VA -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: VA -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: VA ->VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: VANOC -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: VANOC -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: EXPOSURE: SPONSORS: VANOC -> VANOC

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: resources
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: LEVERAGE: RESOURCES: Align and leverage resources

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: Roles and responsibilities
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: able to leverage 2010 opportunities with others easier than others
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: BC Spirit Communities
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: dtes
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: Implementation Agency
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: INCLUSION INITIATIVE: Aboriginal
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: INCLUSION INITIATIVE: Multicultural
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: INCLUSION INITIATIVE: Women
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: INCLUSION INITIATIVE: Youth
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: now's
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: NOW'S: Arts
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: NOW'S: literacy
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: NOW'S: Sport and recreation
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: NOW'S: volunteers
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: partners
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: sectoral Tables
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: SECTORAL TABLES: Arts and Culture
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> LGNOW: SECTORAL TABLES: Sport and Recreation
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> VA: lack of duplicated programs
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> VA: three levels of government
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW -> VANOC: inner city
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: BRIAN DOLSEN
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: BRIAN DOLSEN: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: BRIAN DOLSEN: RESPONSIBILITIES:
 RELATED TO VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: BRUCE DEWAR

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: BRUCE DEWAR: RESPONSIBILITIES:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: BRUCE DEWAR: RESPONSIBILITIES:
 RELATED TO VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: KATHERINE RINGROSE:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: KATHERINE RINGROSE:
 RESPONSIBILITIES: RELATED TO VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: LGNOW: POSITION: KATHERINE RINGROSE:
 RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: Brings people to the table
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: Community development partner for Olympics
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: entrepreneurial
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: Implementing Agency
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: Specialists
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: SPECIALISTS: arts and culture
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> LGNOW: SPECIALISTS: Sport and recreation
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: GOAL: create employment
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: GOAL: dismantle drug scene
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: GOAL: revitalize Hastings corridor
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: GOAL: safety and security
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: governmental agency responsible on behalf of VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: ICI statements
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: Isobel Donovan
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: ISOBEL DONOVAN: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: Jill Davidson
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: JILL DAVIDSON: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: Katrina Elliot
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: KATRINA ELLIOT: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: Wendy Au
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: POSITION: WENDY AU: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VA: sectoral table: housing
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VANOC: host the games
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VANOC: Mainstream rather than marginalize DTES
 issues
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VANOC: Responsible for implementation of ICI
 statements
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VANOC: To influence government as supporter of ICI
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA -> VANOC: Use Olympics as means to get to senior
 government
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA:
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA: POSITION
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VA: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> LGNOW
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> LGNOW: Arts and Culture Sectoral Table
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> LGNOW: Implementing Agency
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> LGNOW: Sports and recreation sectoral table
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VA
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VA: Housing sectoral table
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VA: ICI COMMITMENTS: civil liberties
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VA: Implementing Agency
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VANOC
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VANOC: ICI COMMITMENTS: accessibility
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VANOC: ICI COMMITMENTS: financial
 accountability and transparency
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VANOC: meet ici commitments
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC -> VANOC: procurement
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC: POSITION
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC: RESPONSIBILITIES
 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: VANOC: RESPONSIBILITIES: RELATED TO VA

STRATEGIES:

STRATEGIES: Non ICI Initiatives
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: keys
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: KEYS: Iknow
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: MoreSports:
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: MORESPORTS: Iknow
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: MORESPORTS: va
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: va projects
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: Womens Inclusion Strategy
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: Womens Inclusion Strategy: LGNOW:
 STRATEGIES: NON ICI INITIATIVES: Womens Inclusion Strategy: VA

STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES:
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: 2010 by 2010
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: 2010 BY 2010: va
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Aboriginal sustainability team
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ABORIGINAL SUSTAINABILITY TEAM: Iknow
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Accessible and Inclusive Cities and Communities Initiative
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: bob
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: BOB: LGNOW
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: BOB: VA
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: BOB: VANOC
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Chill
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Chill: LGNOW
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Chill: VA
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Chill: VANOC
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Corporate Engagement Strategy
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Downtown eastside cultural
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: DOWNTOWN EASTSIDE CULTURAL: vanoc
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: DOWNTOWN EASTSIDE CULTURAL: Iknow
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: DOWNTOWN EASTSIDE CULTURAL: va
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Go To Group
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Go To Group: LGNOW
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Go To Group: VA
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Go To Group: VANOC
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Steering Committee:
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Steering Committee: LGNOW
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Steering Committee: VA
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Steering Committee: VANOC
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Work Group
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Work Group: LGNOW
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Work Group: VA
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: ICI Work Group: VANOC
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: Opportunities Now
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: urban aboriginal talent id
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: URBAN ABORIGINAL TALENT ID: LGNOW
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: URBAN ABORIGINAL TALENT ID: VA
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: URBAN ABORIGINAL TALENT ID: VANOC
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: VA 2010 by 2010
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: VA Benefits Agreement
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: VA Corporate Engagement Team
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: VA Economic Team
 STRATEGIES: OLYMPICS RELATED STRATEGIES: VANOC social purchasing

HOW DO THE FOCAL ORGANIZATION (VAS) AND THE STAKEHOLDERS (VANOC AND 2010 Legacies Now Society) DEFINE THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUE(S) UNDERPINNING THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN THE VA?

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT:

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES:
 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: Negative Characteristics
 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTICS: Health Concerns
 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTICS: HIV epidemic crisis
 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTICS: REVITALIZE "poorest postal code in Canada"
 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTICS: Safety Concerns

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: Integrated approach to revitalizing DTES

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: Positive Characteristics

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS: Begin to give people ownership and pride of their community

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS: Build capacity

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS: Highlight positive aspects

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: DTES: POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS: Revitalization without displacement

ISSUES:

ISSUES: another expo

ISSUES: community engagement/participation to

ISSUES: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/PARTICIPATION TO: help identify issues

ISSUES: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/PARTICIPATION TO: implement strategies

ISSUES: False Creek

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF:

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: accessible games

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: civil liberties

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Employment

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: job training:

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: jobs

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: management

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: EMPLOYMENT: welfare

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Health

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HEALTH: ADEQUATE HEALTHCARE

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HEALTH: DRUG ADDICTION

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HEALTH: LACK OF: MEDICAL/DENTAL FACILITIES

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: homelessness

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Housing

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: HOUSING - foundation of social development

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: poor condition of housing stock

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: sro bylaw

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: HOUSING: supportive housing

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: mental illness

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: MENTAL ILLNESS: CLOSING OF RIVERVIEW

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: MENTAL ILLNESS: MISDIAGNOSIS

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Prostitution

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: Safety

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: SAFETY: CRIME

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: SAFETY: PROVIDING SAFE/HEALTHY PLACE TO LIVE

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: SAFETY: REDUCING CRIME

ISSUES: INTEGRATION OF: transportation

WHAT OUTCOMES DO THE VAS, 2010 Legacies Now Society AND VANOC HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH IN THE VA AND HOW WILL THESE BE ASSESSED?

GOALS:

GOALS: Influence government policy to create social change

GOALS: Inter organization communication

GOALS: mutually beneficial goals

GOALS: need for benchmarks

GOALS: reach ici goals

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION:

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: indicators:

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: INDICATORS: lack of indicators:

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: INDICATORS: lack of indicators: Iknow

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: individual organization responsible for evaluation

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: IOCC
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: no system in place
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: Sectoral tables - measurement
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: vanoc for ici indicators

TIMEFRAME:

TIMEFRAME: lgnow
TIMEFRAME: long: after 2010
TIMEFRAME: medium: 2-3 years
TIMEFRAME: To be determined through sectoral tables
TIMEFRAME: va

ORGANIZATION COMPONENT	2010 LegaciesNow Society			Vancouver Agreement				VANOC
	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 4	Admin 1
Social Development								
Work on Balanced Approach Towards DTES	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Provide Ownership To Community	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Focus Beyond Negative Social Issues of DTES	✓	✓	✓					✓
Promote DTES' Culture, Heritage & History	✓	✓						✓
Improve and Strengthen Community Culture	✓	✓	✓					✓
Assist in Community Capacity Building	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Enhance Existing Infrastructure				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Build New Where Needed								✓
Related Specifically to ICIS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Related Beyond ICIS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community Consultation	✓	✓	✓					✓
Identify Issues and Strategies	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Create Legitimacy Within DTES as Long Term Initiative						✓	✓	
Integrated Approach Towards Revitalization	✓	✓						✓
Integration of Economic, Health, Social Strategies	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Means to Address Negative Issues Affecting DTES	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Means to Stabilize Individual's Life				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

ORGANIZATION COMPONENT	2010 LegaciesNow Society			Vancouver Agreement				VANOC Admin 1
	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 4	
Accessible Games	✓	✓						✓
Ensure Community Can Attend Games								✓
Ensure Ticket Prices Are Affordable								✓
Ensure Community is Accessible	✓	✓						
Civil Liberties								✓
Ensure Resident's Rights Are Protected	✓				✓			✓
Economic	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Provide Education and Training	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓
Create Employment Opportunities	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Renew and Create Business Development Opportunities	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Support Local Social Enterprises				✓		✓		✓
Health	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ensure Accessible Adequate Healthcare & Medicare	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ensure Accessible Mental Illness Services	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ensure Accessible Drug Addiction Services	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Support Case Coordination Models				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Address HIV/AIDS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Housing and Homelessness	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Provide Social Housing Services		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Redevelop Poor Condition of Social Housing Stock					✓		✓	
Creation of SRO Bylaw					✓	✓	✓	
Enforce SRO Bylaw				✓	✓		✓	
Support Supportive Housing Programs				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Minimize Homelessness	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Prostitution	✓		✓			✓		
Monitor Local Sex Trade Industry			✓			✓		
Minimize Local Sex Trade Industry	✓		✓			✓		
Safety	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Continue Developing and Providing Safe Place to Live	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce Crime Within DTES	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Transportation	✓							✓
Provide Accessible Transportation to Local Residents	✓							✓
Provide Affordable Transportation to Local Residents								✓
People	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Continue to Support People With Disabilities	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Continue to Support Youth	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
Continue to Support Women	✓	✓	✓			✓		
Continue to Support Aboriginal	✓	✓	✓					

ORGANIZATION COMPONENT	2010 LegaciesNow Society			Vancouver Agreement				VANOC
	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 4	Admin 1
Ultimately Responsible to Plan and Host Olympic Games	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
One of Four Signatories to Plan and Host Olympic Games					✓			✓
Fulfill ICIC Statements	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community Capacity Building								
Create New Infrastructures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Build on Existing Infrastructures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Programs:								
Benefits Agreement	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Procurement Strategy	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Characteristics:								
Catalyst For Social Programs/Policies	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Access to Corporate Sponsorship	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Access to IOC			✓					
ICICS Related:								
Responsible For Financial Accountability								✓
Responsible For Organizational Transparency								✓
Transportation								✓
Accessibility	✓	✓						✓

ORGANIZATION COMPONENT	2010 LegaciesNow Society			Vancouver Agreement				VANOC
	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Admin 4	Admin 1
Factors Facilitating Relationship:								
Inter Organizational Dynamics								
Each Organization's Uniqueness	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shared Commitment/Passion					✓	✓		
Lack of Organizational Turnover			✓			✓	✓	
Added Value of Working Together	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sectoral Tables	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Best Measure to Implement ICICS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
VANOC Board of Directors	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Support Fulfilling ICICS	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Challenge Working with BOD					✓			
Factors Constraining Relationship								
Managing Working Relationship w/ Community	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Allows Better Means to Identify and Address Social Issues	✓	✓	✓					✓
Identify Barriers to Participation						✓		✓
Accessible Transportation								✓
Cost of Daycare								✓
Mutual Meeting Times						✓		
Identifying Appropriate Community Representation				✓	✓			
Identifying Realistic Expectations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Risk of Not Fulfilling ICICS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Governmental Politics				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Lack of Government Funding For Social Programs				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Inadequate Funding For Social Housing				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Government Structure				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Bureaucracy and Impact on Decision Making					✓	✓	✓	
Government Accountability				✓	✓	✓	✓	
DTES as Poorest Postal Code in Canada, Impacted By Government "Cookie Cutter Strategy"							✓	
Inter Organizational Challenges								
Maintaining Momentum Until 2010	✓							
Respecting Organizational Mandates	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
Limited or Strategic Funding	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Measuring Social Return on Investment				✓		✓		✓

